Leeds Church Institute.

LENDING LIBRARY.

The Time allowed for reading this Book is

FOURTEEN DAYS.

[illegible] beyond that period a [illegible]urred.

LEEDS CLERICAL LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY SERMONS,

VOL. I.

NINE SERMONS,

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AND

PRINTED CHIEFLY BETWEEN A.D. 1843—1855,

Now collected into One Volume.

CLERICAL LIBRARY

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

TURN THEE AGAIN, THOU GOD OF HOSTS, LOOK DOWN FROM HEAVEN; BEHOLD AND VISIT THIS VINE. Ps. lxxx. 14.

NEW EDITION.

SOLD BY

JAMES PARKER & CO., OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

AND RIVINGTONS,

LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

MDCCCLXXIX.

PRINTED BY THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY OF THE HOLY TRINITY,
HOLY ROOD, OXFORD. 1879.

PREFACE.

The following sermons (except an early sermon, on the appointment of the then vice-Chancellor) were preached before the University and printed during a period of 13 years and under different circumstances.

The three first, the first on the Holy Eucharist, and the two on "the Entire Absolution of the penitent," were part of a series of sermons, preached at a time when the minds of the young men had been stirred up by an earnest teaching of repentance. They were, with others, intended to comfort them amid the sense of past deep, but repented sin. The two first sermons of this series were 1) on the unfathomable mercies of God in Christ; the abyss of mercy contained in that great mystery, that, for us sinners and for our salvation, God became Man. 2) The continual Intercession of our Lord, God-Man, at the Right Hand of God. These, as well as the two last of the series, on God's acceptance of deeds of love to the bodies and souls of Christ's members, I was about to publish some years since, when a desk which contained them was stolen from me.

After this, there followed a time, when the minds of many of our younger members were distracted in regard

to the faith, as held in the English Church; for their sakes the sermon "on the rule of faith" was preached, as well as one on the objective unity which exists in the Body of Christ, through the Presence of God the Holy Ghost, and the participation of Christ through the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, although Intercommunion is suspended between its great Branches, the Eastern, the Western, and our own. This was never published; for, while the notes with which I wished to accompany it, were delayed through other calls, the time, for which it was intended, had passed by.

The sermon on Justification was intended to promote peace, by shewing the agreement which really prevails, apart from some modes of stating that truth.

The first sermon on the Holy Eucharist was wholly practical, and uncontroversial. It implied, rather than stated, even the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence; and was written, chiefly in language of the Fathers. Its one object was to inculcate the love of our Redeemer for us sinners in the Holy Eucharist, both as a Sacrament and as a commemorative Sacrifice. As a Sacrament, in that He, our Redeemer, God and Man, vouchsafes to be "our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament[a]." As a commemorative Sacrifice, in that He enables us therein to plead to the Father that One meritorious Sacrifice on the Cross, which He, our High Priest, unceasingly pleads in His own Divine Person in Heaven. Both these doctrines I briefly renewed in the beginning of my first Sermon, after my suspension was ended. In the second Sermon on the Holy Eucharist, preached ten years after the first, I repeated more definitely the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. In it, besides its practical bearings,

[a] First Exhort. in Communion-Service.

I sought to make good, in regard both to Holy Scripture and the Fathers, the teaching of the English Church, in contrast with that of the Schoolmen [b], as to the continuance of the visible elements in their natural substances. I wished in it to shew the distinctness and tenableness of the ground held by the English Church, and to anticipate a teaching in which that distinctive ground was ignored. What I stated there in sum and outline, I endeavoured to exhibit and prove in detail, in a work in which I embodied, I believe, every passage in every Christian writing published, until the middle of the fifth century after the Birth of our Lord [c]. I believe that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence will be found to be the point of divergence in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as Baptismal regeneration is in the doctrines of grace. As men accept or reject it, so, if they are consistent, will they retain the whole belief of the Ancient Church on this doctrine, or they will be mere Zwinglians. The rejection of that doctine really involves the denial of any Presence of our Lord, other than that by which He is always present among His people, or of any other gift than the ordinary gift of His grace, which He bestows always and every where. Indeed, the gift of grace which those ordinarily believe who deny the real objective Presence, falls far short of the indwelling of God the Holy Ghost,of which Holy Scripture speaks as the ordinary privilege of Christians. Happily, for the present, people's hearts believe better than their understandings acknowledge.

[b] I say, the Schoolmen, because the Roman Church has tacitly modified the meaning of the word "substance" by allowing that the elements retain their *natural* power of nourishing, (Catech. Conc. Trid.) which all the Schoolmen denied. The Church of Rome has not explained what it means by a change of substance, while it allows that every thing remains which we understand by the word "substance."

[c] The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers, from the death of S. John the Evangelist to the fourth General Council A. D. 451.

The sudden and almost entire cessation of all censure, after the publication and wide diffusion of that sermon [d], as contrasted with the reports which were circulated beforehand, were and are to me a satisfactory evidence, that I had not, in the judgment of most Churchmen, as I knew that I had not in fact, spoken therein otherwise than in accordance with the doctrine of the English Church. The absence of any sound of objection to the second sermon, which contained the selfsame doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, only enunciated more dogmatically than it had been in the first, shewed that even those who condemned the first sermon, saw no objection to the doctrine thus enunciated. Had the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence been condemned on the first occasion, the renewed preaching of that doctrine would, of course, have been an act of contumacy.

In 1855, yet another period had come, when rationalism, in varied degrees of intensity, became one of the dominant diseases amongst us. A clear definite system, such as that contained in the well known maxim, "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus," might by God's blessing, have held this in check. The principle, on which this maxim is based, commends itself instinctively to our reason, our affections, our faith. We must believe, as matter of faith, that our Lord fulfilled His promise to His Apostles, that after His departure, God the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, should "lead them into the whole truth," the whole compass of the revelation, which He willed to make to man-

[d] That sermon must have been extensively read, in consequence of the condemnation of the writer by the then Vice-Chancellor, and the majority of the six Doctors whom he chose as his advisers, since nearly 18000 copies of the sermon were sold at once, besides the reprint of the whole sermon in the Sunday Times, and another Newspaper. The cessation of blame, upon the appearance of the Sermon, was noticed by others and publicly stated at the time, without contradiction.

kind. We cannot but believe that the Apostles whom He chose, imparted to those whom they converted to the faith, that full knowledge which they had received, this being the object for which they received it. The concurrent testimony of all, in all Churches, every where, that so they had received, so they had been taught by those who had been before them, this had been the faith of their fathers from the beginning, cannot be rejected, without bringing in one flood of universal scepticism as to all human evidence, which would destroy all human trust as well as all Divine Faith. Those who revived this appeal to Catholic antiquity had a twofold object. They wished, in contrast with the practical narrowness of much of the popular teaching of the day, to inculcate the whole breadth of Christian doctrine, as it is there taught; they felt also the need of an authority on which the human mind might rest, beyond and apart from itself and its own convictions. That authority our old Divines taught us to seek in the consent of the early undivided Church, from which we derive our creeds, our prayers, our administration of the Sacraments, and to which even those who know it not, owe ultimately, if their faith is sound, the soundness of their faith. The promotion of holiness, and of the reception of that one faith, against which our Lord said that the gates of hell should not prevail, have been the central objects of those, whom men called Tractarians. Had half the zeal which has been expended against them, been employed in the enforcement of positive truth, the cause of truth and the souls of men had not so suffered, nor would truth have lost so many of its defenders among us. While the attention of divers of those, invested with different degrees of authority, both within and without the University, was concentrated in

repressing Tractarianism, Rationalism found the portals thrown wide open to her, and entered in unsuspected, as an ally.

I say thus much, not to criminate others, nor to explain, as an historical fact, the value attached to authority by the old Tractarians, but because controversy, to so great a degree, in one section of the Church, still takes the place of the teaching of positive truth. If all taught, *positively*, what they believed as truth, men would the sooner be brought to the knowledge of the truth. Through controversy, as now waged, truth itself receives the blows, which are aimed at individuals.

The object of the two sermons preached in 1855 was not, to meet any detail of misbelief, or unbelief, but to warn any who would be warned, against two common perils, that of seeking for faith as it is not to be found, and that of mistaking for a living Divine Faith, some broken fragments of an abandoned Creed. Faith is the gift of God. In vain then will any who have unhappily lost or impaired it, attempt to recover it by a mere intellectual study of evidence. The object of Faith is one God. Unless we believe Him wholly, we do not believe Him at all. If, on any ground of their own repugnance, men disbelieve anything which God has revealed, then, whatever else they hold is the conclusion of their own understanding, not from God. They have, in fact, no faith. They believe certain things *of* God, as a Heathen may; they do not believe *in* God. If, on the contrary, men seek faith from God, and, by His grace, submit themselves with their whole hearts to all which He has revealed, He will not let such err, in any matter which shall affect their salvation.

In collecting these sermons at this time, it is most natural

to add a few brief words on one subject, which has recently furnished matter for popular controversy, and in which our Lord's words, "I came not to send peace on earth but a sword," have been again fulfilled. That which He gave us for peace, peace of conscience, peace in Him Who is our Peace, men have turned into a sword, and made a subject of strife and divison.

On the subject of Confession, the real ground of objection is that which is seldom put forward, the dread of priestly authority; what *is* put forward, has a religious or an amiable aspect. In the objection as to priestly authority, men ignore 1) that confession has been made just as much by the priests themselves as by the people, and probably very few priests have received, who have not themselves used, confession. This supposed "priestly authority" is one then, to which the priests have subjected themselves. 2) When confession is purely voluntary, as in the English Church, it is idle to speak of authority, as liable to abuse. Authority lies the other way. People are far more free, not to use confession, than to use it. The use of confession has been simply the dictate of a man's own conscience; the world shrugs its shoulders at it; no priest can, as a minister of the Church of England, require, enjoin it, or teach it to be necessary; Communion is open to all who have a true penitent heart; and whether they have this, God, not man, is the judge. Priests have no authority, except the authority from God, to absolve, in His Name, those who truly repent them of their sins.

But, apart from this which is a mere phantom of irreligious minds, two popular misconceptions of Confession, as actually practised, are said to have been endorsed by a Bishop in a charge delivered in this year.

The one he pointedly describes as "the substitution of confession to a priest for the conversion of the heart to God." Any practice, which could be described under those terms, would plainly be an entire perversion of confession, a mockery of God, a profanation of His Ordinance, a delusion of the sinner's soul, a "speaking peace, peace, and there is no peace," to the condemnation of both in the Judgment Day.

But I never heard of any such practice. The cases in which the Church of England suggests confession, are, when a man "feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter," when he "cannot quiet his conscience." But in such persons conscience is alive, not dead. It speaks; it pricks; it gushes forth in repentance. Absolution, plainly, is for the living, not for those still dead; for those whom Christ's voice has awakened, not for those still asleep in trespassess and sins.

The resurrection of Lazarus, and his unloosing by the disciples, has, since S. Augustine's time, ever been owned as furnishing also a vivid emblem of the spiritual resurrection of the sinner, and his absolution, when risen. Christ awakens and gives life; the Apostles, at His command, unloose the grave clothes. Christ says to His servants, "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven." He uses the voice of man to pronounce His forgiveness to the penitent; but these He has Himself already converted, and given them repentance unto life.

The whole restoration of confession was, as I have said, spontaneous. Men taught earnest repentance, and said not one word about confession and absolution. They whose hearts were touched, and who had been converted to God, themselves, of themselves, sought the relief of confession.

A certain amount of confession there had been in times past; but this extensive revival of confession began with the people, not with the priests. The sermons on confession in the present volume were the result of many years' experience. And as confession began, so, I believe, it continued. It would be a most grievous mistake, if any were to lead persons to confession, as a means of bringing them to repentance. It would be like striving to reanimate a corpse. Confession is a relief appointed for a penitent heart; it is a means of further grace to those to whom God has given the grace of repentance. But it would be increased death to the impenitent and unconverted. If there be any tendency anywhere to "substitute confession to a priest for conversion of the heart to God," the Bishop of Winchester might well have spoken much more strongly than he is reported to have done. Instead of saying that "our congregations would not tolerate it," he might have said "God would not endure it." Such a perversion as this, would have been "the sewing pillows to all armholes," making people easy in unrepented sin, which God calls a "lying to My people," and upon which He pronounces "woe."

But of the abuse of which the Bishop speaks, I have not heard. Of course, man may be deceived, and think those penitent who are really unconverted. Such deceit there has always been. "We do not," says S. Cyprian [e], "anticipate the judgment of the Lord Who will come to judge, but that, if He shall find a sinner's penitence full and entire, He will then ratify what has here been determined by us; if, however, any have deluded us by a feigned penitence, God, Who is not mocked, and Who looketh on the heart of

[e] See below Serm. 1. on Absolution p. 46, 7.

man, will judge of those whom we have not seen through, and the Lord will correct the sentence of His servants. Only we, brothers, ought to remember that it is written, 'a brother that helpeth a brother, shall be exalted,' and that the Apostle has also said, 'Considering yourselves, lest ye also be tempted, bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ.'" Man can only "[f] teach and premonish, feed and provide for the Lord's family, seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad." God alone can touch the heart, waken the dead in sins, give repentance unto life. But I know of no one who, whether teacher or taught, has substituted confession to a priest for conversion of the heart to God, or who has forgotten that, in confessing to God's Minister, he was at the same time confessing to God the Searcher of hearts.

I have used the Bishop's term "conversion of heart to God," as equivalent to "true repentance, wrought by the grace of God." I have supposed the misuse of confession, which he condemns, to be, resting in the outward form of confession, without inward conversion or repentance. Whether that conversion or repentance, which is presupposed in the use of our daily or weekly public confession to God in Church as well as in private confession to God before His priest, and which, again, is required of all who come to Holy Communion, be sincere or no, God alone, who reads the heart, can tell. Man does not always know it as to his own heart. All which man may be able to tell, is that he is sorry to have offended God, that he desires henceforth to please God, and never more to offend Him. But many who desire this, fall back again. They are not, on that account, and may not be, excluded from

[f] Service for the Ordination of Priests.

Communion, or from any other ordinance of God. The use of the means of grace is often the condition of perseverance. God, by His grace in them, often strengthens the weak will. And if men relapse, the remedy is not to be sought in the neglect or delay of the means of grace. God allows His grace to be manifoldly wasted. He is prodigal of His grace, and will allow any thing to be lost, sooner than a human soul, the price of the Blood of Jesus. All, which the Church or man can require of those who come to any Ordinance of God, is sincerity of heart, as far as they know themselves. If by undue authority, we put off people from the reception of any means of grace, we should not be Ministers of Him, who bids us "restore in the spirit of meekness those overtaken in a fault," to "lift up the hands which hang down and the feeble knees," Who Himself admitted the disciple who betrayed Him, to the Communion of His own Body and Blood. Although His own Gifts, in that case, failed of any benefit to the soul of Judas, He taught us thereby not to be scandalised, like the Novatians, at the failure of His Ordinances, but to persevere in receiving those who profess the desire of communion with Him. It is known that, in the case of some besetting sins, frequent use of the means of grace is, above all, a special remedy against them. The austere repulsion of the relapsed drives them to hopelessness. Those win most souls, who, in man's sight, seem even lax, out of their tenderness for souls, for love of Jesus. Amid frequent use of the means of grace, God often triumphs, not only over man's weakness and unfaithfulness, but even over the waste of His own grace.

Another misconception the Bishop alludes to, rather

than states. It is, in plain words, the fear lest women who had not broken the seventh commandment should, if they use Confession, be subjected to questions about it. There is but one answer, and I am sure that every priest would make it, viz. that to ask any woman, who had not either notoriously been guilty of such breach, or who did not expressly confess it, about that commandment, would be utterly hateful and abhorrent to him.

Apart from the fact that the office of the Minister of God is, in whatever way he may, to guard purity, our English natures revolt from imagining evil of this sort. Degraded as, in too many cases, are the marriages of our peasantry, no Parish priest would suspect evil of this kind, which he did not know. The bad alone suspect evil. There is something so beautiful in innocency, that no one can bear to imagine it tarnished. Our young men suffer from our unsuspicion. They are mostly unwarned against much deadly sin, destructive of body and soul, out of fear lest they should be taught evil by being, however distantly, warned against it. The fear that the confession of sin should become an occasion of unbefitting questions about other sin, is a mere idle phantom. It has been devised with wonderful skill, to rouse our English fears, lest the wives and daughters of our English homes should hear, by means of religion, what we should wish them not to know of. It betokens *his* wonderful skill, who knows that confession has often been the means of hindering souls from relapsing into his power, and who knows well the weak points of the human heart, which he has so often essayed successfully. English priests have the feelings of Englishmen. They have had sisters, if they have not been, as most of them have been, husbands and fathers.

"What thou wouldest not do, that thou shouldest not suspect." Englishmen should be ashamed of imagining that other Englishmen of reputation and principle speak that, which they themselves would be ashamed to speak; Christians should be afraid of putting forth, for party-purposes, imputations which they do not themselves believe.

Not the least remarkable characteristic of this controversy, on the part of those who have endeavoured to stir up a popular clamour against confession, has been, that men, not content with having the largest freedom of clearing their own consciences before God in whatever way they think good, have sought to abridge the liberty of their fellow Christians, and to restrain them from quieting their consciences in a way which the Church of England suggests to them. As though men's own freedom were not complete, so long as all members of the Church did not use it! a freedom, most like that which our Lord reproved severely, "Ye entered not in yourselves, and those who were entering in, ye hindered."

CHRIST CHURCH.
Easter, 1859.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST A COMFORT TO THE PENITENT.

Preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ on the fourth Sunday after Easter 1843.

St. Matt. xxvi. 28.

This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

SERMON II.

ENTIRE ABSOLUTION OF THE PENITENT. I.

Preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ on the fourth Sunday after the Epiphany 1846.

St. John. xx. 21-23.

Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

SERMON III.

ENTIRE ABSOLUTION OF THE PENITENT. II.

Preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ on the first Sunday in Advent 1846.

1 Cor. xi. 31.

If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

SERMON IV.

THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

Preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ, on the second Sunday after Epiphany 1853.

1 Cor. x. 16.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?

SERMON V.

JUSTIFICATION.

Preached at S. Mary's on the twenty second Sunday after Trinity 1853.

St. James, ii. 22.

Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

SERMON VI.

THE RULE OF FAITH, AS MAINTAINED BY THE FATHERS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ on the fifth Sunday after the Epiphany 1851.

2 Tim. i. 13, 14.

Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.

SERMON VII.

ALL FAITH THE GIFT OF GOD.

Preached at St. Mary's on the twenty third Sunday after Trinity 1855.

1 Cor. iv. 7.

What hast thou that thou didst not receive? now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou didst not receive it?

SERMON VIII.

REAL FAITH ENTIRE.

Preached at the Cathedral Church of Christ on the twenty fourth Sunday after Trinity, 1855.

Rom. i. 4.

By Whom we have received Grace and Apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations, for His Name.

SERMON IX.

PATIENCE AND CONFIDENCE THE STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH.

Preached at St. Mary's on Sunday November 5th. 1837.

Exod. xiv. 13.

Fear ye not, stand still and see the salvation af the Lord, which He will shew to you to-day.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST A COMFORT TO THE PENITENT.

A SERMON

PREACHED

BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY,

IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, IN OXFORD,

ON THE FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1843.

"The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this Supper, some of them, the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life. All which sayings both of the holy Scripture and godly men, truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast, if we would often call to mind, O how would they inflame our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food!" *Homilies, 1st Part of the Sermon on the Sacrament.*

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

PREFACE.

It is with pain that the following Sermon is published. For it is impossible for any one not to foresee one portion of its effects; what floods, namely, of blasphemy against holy truth will be poured forth by the infidel or heretical or secular and anti-religious papers with which our Church and country is at this time afflicted. It is like casting with one's own hands, that which is most sacred to be outraged and profaned. Still there seem to be higher duties, which require even this. The Gospel must be a savour unto life or a savour unto death; from the first, it has been blasphemed, wherever it has been preached. It has been blasphemed by Jews, Pagans, and each class of heretics as they arose; the Arians used blasphemous jests, taught the people blasphemous ballads, and profaned the Holy Eucharist; increase of scoffers and blasphemers is among the tokens of the last days; and yet the two witnesses are to bear testimony, though in sackcloth. The more the truth prevails, the madder must the world become; the blasphemies with which holy truth is now assailed, are but a token of its victories.

The first duty of a Minister of Christ is to His little ones; for their sakes, lest any be perplexed in consequence of all which has been lately said, this Sermon is published; and for them the following explanation is intended.

Nothing, throughout the whole Sermon, was further from my thoughts than controversy. I had, on such occasions as my office afforded, commenced a course of Sermons on the

comforts provided by the Gospel for the penitent amid the consciousness of sin, with the view to meet the charge of sternness, involved by the exhibition of one side of Catholic truth; in this course, the sacred subject of the Holy Eucharist, of necessity, came in its order; and it was my wish (however I may have been hindered by sudden indisposition from developing my meaning as I wished) to point out its comforting character to the penitent in two ways; 1st) indirectly, because it is the Body and Blood of his Lord, and is the channel of His Blessed Presence to the soul, 2ndly) because in Holy Scripture the mention of remission of sins is connected with it.

In essaying to teach this, I could not but forget controversy; having, in the commencement, warned against irreverent disputings, I lived for the time in holy Scripture and its deepest expositors, the Fathers, and was careful to use rather their language than my own, lest, on so high a subject, I should seem to speak over-boldly. Conscious of my own entire adherence to the formularies of my Church, and having already repeatedly expressed myself on this subject, and in the very outset of this Sermon conveyed at once, that I believed the elements to "remain in their natural substances," and that I did not attempt to define the *mode* of the Mystery that they were also the Body and Blood of Christ[a], I had no fear of being misunderstood.

Once more to repeat my meaning, in order to relieve any difficulties which might (if so be) be entertained by pious minds, trained in an opposed and defective system of teaching, before whom the Sermon may now be brought. My own views were cast, (so to speak) in the mould of the minds of Bp. Andrewes[b] and Abp. Bramhall[b], which I regarded as the type of the teaching of our Church. From them originally, and with them, I learnt to receive in their

[a] p. 7. [b] See Appendix.

literal sense, our Blessed Lord's solemn words, " This is My Body," and from them, while I believe the consecrated elements to become, by virtue of His consecrating Words, truly and really, yet spiritually and in an ineffable way, His Body and Blood, I learnt also to withhold my thoughts as to the *mode* of this great Mystery, but " as a Mystery" to " adore it[b]." With the Fathers then, and our own great Divines, (explaining, as I believe, the true meaning of our Church[c],) I could not but speak of the consecrated elements, as being, what, since He has so called them, I believe them to become, His Body and Blood; and I feared not, that, using their language, I should, when speaking of Divine and " spiritual" things, be thought to mean otherwise than " spiritually," or having disclaimed all thoughts as to the *mode* of their being, that any should suppose I meant a *mode* which our Church disallows.

It remains only to say, that the notes (with a few exceptions) are such as, amid hurry and severe indisposition, I could, when my Sermon was demanded, put together, with the view at once of shewing those who were to pronounce upon it, that I had not used high language, of my own mind, and that they might not unconsciously blame the Fathers, while they thought they were blaming myself only. They spread over the wider space, because,

[b] Bp. Andrews, ib.

[c] As shewn by the use of the Ancient words, " The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," (rejected in Edw. VI. 2d Book.) the Rubric for " the *reverent* eating and drinking" of the consecrated elements which remain, and the Article, which, while declaring that " the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a spiritual and heavenly manner," by the use of the words " given" and " taken," shews that it calls That " the Body of Christ" which is " given" by the minister, " taken" by the people. (See Knox's Remains, ii. p. 170.) In like way, the Catechism teaches that " The Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed taken* and received of the faithful, in the Lord's Supper." The very strength of the words of the Rubric denying " the *Corporal* Presence of Christ's *natural* Flesh and Blood" in itself implies (as we know of those who inserted that Rubric) that they believed every thing short of this.

wholly unconscious what could be objected to, I was reduced to conjecture what it might be.

The Appendix is now drawn up by a friend, (the writer being disabled) with the same view, that some might be saved from objecting to what, though often taught, may be new to them, when they see that the same, or things much stronger, have been taught by a series of Divines in our Church. It is not meant that some of these writers (e. g. Mede) are always consistent with themselves; it is meant only to shew what has been taught, partly without rebuke, partly with authority, in our later English Church. Nor has it been the object to select the strongest passages of our writers; on the contrary, some stronger than any here quoted have been purposely passed by, out of a writer so universally received as G. Herbert[d]. The general tone of doctrine has been the object chiefly had in view in the selection. Some of the materials of the Catena have been already used in previous explanations on the doctrine[e]. Especially, it has been a great comfort to see, with what depth of reverential thought and love the connection of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist with that of the Incarnation, so inadequately stated in the Sermon, although in the footsteps of the Ancient Fathers, has, in our own Church, been inculcated in the practical teaching of Bp. Andrewes, from whose more definite statements in controversy, my own views, as I stated, had received their definite form.

Passages or phrases, here and there, in the Sermon, were, on account of the length of the whole, omitted in the

[d] Both in his Poems and his Country Parson, which forms part of the Clergyman's Instructor, a work printed by the University, and recommended by Bishops to Candidates for Ordination.

[e] Tracts, No. 81; Mr. Newman's "Letter to Dr. Faussett;" Bishop of Exeter's Charge; my "Letter to Dr. Jelf;" "the doctrine of the Catholic Church in England on the Holy Eucharist."

delivery; they were inserted in the copy called for, in brackets, as making the whole more authentic; these distinctions are now omitted, as needlessly distracting such as may read for edification, since in one instance only did the passages so omitted contain doctrine, viz. the words from the fathers from "and by commingling" to "Divine Nature," p. 17, 18.

And now, may God have mercy on this His Church! It is impossible not to see, that a controversy has been awakened, which, from the very sacredness of the subject, and the vagueness of the views of many, and the irreverence of the age, one should, of all others, most have deprecated. Yet things are in His hands, not in man's; and He, Who has so mercifully overruled every trial and every strife hitherto, to the greater good of this His Church, will, we doubt not, if we obtain from Him patient hearts, so overrule this also. And if, since I can now speak in no other manner, I may, in this way, utter one word to the young, to whom I have heretofore spoken from a more solemn place, I would remind them, how, almost prophetically, sixteen years ago, in the volume, which was the unknown dawn and harbinger of the re-awakening of deeper truth, this was given as the watchword to those who should love the truth, "In [a] quietness and confidence shall be your strength." There have been manifold tokens, that patience is one great grace which God is now calling forth in our Church. "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Sore then though it be to see, as we must see, the truth of God cast out and spoken against and trodden under foot of many, they who love it, may well be patient, when He, Whose truth it is, bears so patiently with us all; sure, that even when it seems to be trampled upon, it will thereby but sink the deeper into the "good

[a] Is. xxx. 27. Motto to "The Christian Year," 1827.

ground" of the "honest and good heart," thence to spring up multiplied, in His good time, "thirty, sixty, an hundred fold."

Christ Church,
Ember Week after Feast of Pentecost,
1843.

MATT. xxvi. 28.

This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

IT is part of the manifold wisdom of God, that His gifts, in nature and in grace, minister to distinct, and, as it often seems, unconnected ends; manifesting thereby the more His own Unity, as the secret cause and power of all things, putting Itself forward in varied forms and divers manners, yet Itself the one Cause of all that is. The element which is the image of our Baptism, cleanses alike and refreshes, enlighteneth the fainting eye, wakens to life, as it falls, a world in seeming exhaustion and death, changes the barren land into a garden of the Lord, gives health and nourishment and growth. And if in nature, much more in the Gifts of Grace. For therein God, not by Will or by Power only, but by Himself and the Effluence of His Spirit, is the Life of all which lives through Him. Our One Lord is to us, in varied forms, all, yea more than all, His disciples dare ask or think. All are His Life, flowing through all His members, and in all, as it is admitted, effacing death, enlarging life. As blind, He is our Wisdom; as sinful, our Righteousness; as hallowed, our Sanctification; as recovered from Satan, our Redemption; as sick, our Physician; as weak, our Strength; as unclean, our Fountain; as darkness, our Light; as daily fainting, our daily Bread; as dying, Life Eternal; as asleep in Him, our Resurrection.

It is, then, according to the analogy of His other gifts, that His two great Sacraments have in themselves manifold

gifts. Baptism containeth not only remission of sin, actual or original, but maketh members of Christ, children of God, heirs of Heaven, hath the seal and earnest of the Spirit, the germ of spiritual life; the Holy Eucharist imparteth not life only, spiritual strength, and oneness with Christ, and His Indwelling, and participation of Him, but, in its degree, remission of sins also. As the manna is said to have "contented every man's delight and agreed to every taste[a]," so He, the Heavenly Manna, becometh to every man what he needeth, and what he can receive; to the penitent perhaps chiefly remission of sins and continued life, to those who have "loved Him and kept His word," His own transporting, irradiating Presence, full of His own grace and life and love; yet to each full contentment, because to each His own overflowing, undeserved, goodness.

Having then, on former occasions, spoken of the Fountain of all comfort, our Redeeming Lord, His Life for us and Intercession with the Father, as the penitent's stay amid the overwhelming consciousness of his sins, it may well suit, in this our season of deepest joy, to speak of that, which, flowing from the throne of the Lamb which was slain, is to the penitent, the deepest river of his joy, the Holy Mysteries; from which, as from Paradise, he feels that he deserves to be shut out, from which perhaps, in the holier discipline of the Ancient Church, he would have been for a time removed, but which to his soul must be the more exceeding precious, because they are the Body and Blood of His Redeemer. While others joy with a more Angelic joy, as feeding on Him, Who is the Angels' food, and "sit," as St. Chrysostom[b] says, "with Angels and Archangels and heavenly powers, clad with the kingly robe of Christ itself, yea clad with the King Himself, and having spiritual armoury," he may be the object of the joy of

[a] Wisd. xvi. 20.

[b] Hom. 46. in S. Joh. fin.

Angels; and while as a penitent he approaches as to the Redeemer's Side, he may hope that having so been brought, he, with the penitent, shall not be parted from It, but be with Him and near Him in Paradise. "To the holier," says another[c], "He is more precious as God; to the sinner more precious is the Redeemer. Of higher value and avail is He to him, who hath more grace; yet to him also to whom much is forgiven, doth He the more avail, because "to whom much is forgiven, he loveth much."

Would that in the deep joy of this our Easter festival, the pledge of our sealed forgiveness, and the earnest of endless life in God, we could, for His sake by Whom we have been redeemed, lay aside our wearisome strifes, and that to speak of the mysteries of Divine love might not become the occasion of unloving and irreverent disputings. Would that, at least in this sacred place, we could dwell in thought, together, on His endless condescension and loving-kindness, without weighing in our own measures, words which must feebly convey Divine mysteries; rather intent (as so many in this day seem) on detecting that others have spoken too strongly on that which is unfathomable, than on ourselves adoring that Love, which is past finding out. "When we speak of spiritual things," is S. Chrysostom's[d] warning, on approaching this same subject, "be there nothing of this life, nothing earthly in our thoughts; let all such things depart and be cast out, and be we wholly given to the hearing of the Divine word. When the Spirit discourseth to us, we should listen with much stillness, yea with much awe. For the things this day read are worthy of awe. "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.'"

The penitent's joy, then, in the Holy Eucharist is not the less deep, because the pardon of sins is not, as in Bap-

[c] S. Ambrose de Jos. c. 3. §. 14. [d] Hom. 47. in S. Joh. init.

tism, its direct provision. The two great Sacraments, as their very signs shew, have not the same end. Baptism gives, the Holy Eucharist preserves and enlarges life. Baptism engraffs into the true Vine; the Holy Eucharist derives the richness and fulness of His life into the branches thus engraffed. Baptism buries in Christ's tomb, and through it He quickens with His life; the Holy Eucharist is given not to the dead, but to the living. It augments life, or—death; gives immortality to the living; to the dead it gives not life, but death; it is a savour of life or death, is received to salvation or damnation. Whence the ancient Church so anxiously withheld from it such as sinned grievously, not as an example only to others, but in tenderness to themselves, lest they break through and perish; "profane," says S. Cyprian [e], "the Holy Body of the Lord," not themselves be sanctified; fall deeper, not be restored; be wounded more grievously, not be healed; since it is said, he adds, "Whoso eateth the Bread and drinketh the Cup of the Lord unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord."

The chief object, then, of the Holy Eucharist, as conveyed by type or prophecy, by the very elements chosen, or by the words of our Lord, is the support and enlargement of life, and that in Him. In type [f], the tree of life was within the Paradise of God, given as a nourishment of immortality, withheld from Adam when he sinned; the bread and wine, wherewith Melchizedek met Abraham, were to refresh the father of the faithful, the weary warrior of God; the Paschal Lamb was a commemorative sacrifice; the saving blood had been shed; it was to be

[e] Ep. 15. ad Mart. and Ep. 16. ad Presb.

[f] All the following types, as also that of the "burning coal" referred to hereafter, are received (with some others) even by the learned Lutheran J. Gerhard, (de S. Cœn. c. 2.) as are some of the verbal prophecies; all are currently found among the Fathers.

eaten with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, and with bitter herbs, the type of mortification, and by those only who were undefiled. The Manna was given to them after they had passed the Red Sea, the image of cleansing Baptism, and, as He Himself interprets it, represented Him as coming down from heaven, to give life unto the world, the food of Angels and the holy hosts of heaven; the Shew-bread was eaten only by those hallowed to the Priesthood, (as the whole Christian people has in this sense been made kings and priests,) and, when once given to David and those that were with him, still on the ground that the "vessels of the young men were holy[g]." The Angel brought the cake to Elijah, that in the strength of that food, he might go forty days and forty nights unto the Mount of God. In verbal prophecy, it is foretold under the images of the very elements, and so of strengthening and overflowing joy. "Wisdom," that is, He Who is the Wisdom of God, in a parable corresponding to that of the marriage feast, crieth, "Come eat of My bread and drink of the wine I have mingled." Or, in the very Psalm of His Passion and atoning Sacrifice, it is foretold, that "the poor shall eat and be satisfied;" or that He, the good Shepherd, shall prepare a Table for those whom He leadeth by the still waters of the Church, and giveth them the Cup of overflowing joy;" or as the source of gladness, "Thou hast put gladness into my heart, since the time that their corn and wine and oil (the emblem of the Spirit of which the faithful drink) increased," and "the wine which gladdeneth man's heart, and the oil which maketh his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart;" or of spiritual growth, "corn and wine shall make the young men and maidens of Zion to grow;" or as that which alone is satisfying, "buy wine without money and without price," for that "which is not bread;" or as the

[g] 1 Sam. xxi. 5.

special Gift to the faithful, "He hath given meat unto them that fear Him;" or that which, after His Passion, He drinketh anew with His disciples in His Father's kingdom, "I have gathered my myrrh, I have drunk my wine with my milk; eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved."

In all these varied symbols, strength, renewed life, growth, refreshment, gladness, likeness to the Angels, immortality, are the gifts set forth; they are gifts as to the Redeemed of the Lord placed anew in the Paradise of His Church, admitted to His Sanctuary, joying in His Presence, growing before Him, filled with the river of His joy, feasting with Him, yea Himself feasting in them, as in them He hungereth [g]. Hitherto, there is no allusion to sin; it is what the Church should be, walking in the brightness of His light, and itself reflecting that brightness.

And when our Lord most largely and directly is setting forth the fruits of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, He speaks throughout of one Gift, life; freedom from death, life through Him, through His indwelling, and therefore resurrection from the dead, and life eternal. "This is the Bread, which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever; and the Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last Day." "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood

g S. Ambr. de Myst. fin. S. Jerome, Ep. 120. ad Hedib. q. 2. on S. Matt. xxvi. 29. "Moses gave us not the true Bread, but the Lord Jesus; Himself feasting, and the feast; Himself eating, and Who is eaten; (Ipse conviva et convivium, ipse comedens et qui comeditur.) We drink His Blood, and without Himself we cannot drink it.—Let us do His will—and Christ will drink with us His own Blood in the kingdom of the Church."

dwelleth in Me and I in Him." "As the Living Father hath sent Me and I live by The Father, so he that eateth Me, he also shall live by Me." "He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever." No one can observe how this whole discourse circleth round this gift of life, and how our Lord, with unwearied patience, bringeth this one truth before us in so many different forms, without feeling that He means to inculcate, that life in Him is His chief gift in His Sacrament, and to make a reverent longing for it an incentive to our faith. Yet although life in Him is the substance of His whole teaching, the teaching itself is manifold. Our Lord inculcates not one truth only in varied forms, but in its different bearings. He answers not the strivings of the Jews, "how can this man give us His Flesh to eat?" Such an "how can these things be?" He never answereth; and we, if we are wise, shall never ask how[h] they can be elements of this world and yet His very Body and Blood. But how they give life to us, He does answer; and amid this apparent uniformity of His teaching, each separate sentence gives us a portion of that answer. And the teaching of the whole, as far as such as we may grasp it, is this. That He[i] is

[h] "Marvel not hereat, nor inquire in Jewish manner 'how,'" &c. S. Cyr. in S. Joh. l. iv. p. 362. Add. p. 358, 5.

[i] "When the Son saith that He was sent, He signifieth His Incarnation and nothing else; but by Incarnation we mean that He became wholly man. As then the Father, He saith, made Me man, and since I was begotten of That Which is, by nature, Life, I, being God the Word, 'live,' and, having become man, filled My Temple, that is, My Body, with Mine own nature, so then, in like manner, shall he also who eateth My Flesh, live by Me. For I took mortal flesh; but, having dwelt in it, being by nature Life because I am of The living Father, I have transmuted it wholly into My own life. The corruption of the flesh conquered not Me, but I conquered it, as God. As then (for I again say it, unwearied, since it is to profit) although I was made flesh, (for the 'being sent' meaneth this,) again I live through the living Father, that is, retaining in Myself the natural excellence (εὐφυΐαν) of Him Who begat Me, so also he, who, by the participation of My Flesh, receiveth Me, shall have life in himself, being wholly and altogether transferred

the Living Bread, because He came down from Heaven, and as being One God with the Father, hath life in Himself, even as the Father hath life in Himself; the life then which He is, He imparted to that Flesh which He took into Himself, yea, which He took so wholly, that Holy Scripture says, He became it, "the Word became flesh," and since it is thus a part of Himself, "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood," (He Himself says the amazing words,) "eateth Me," and so receiveth into Himself, in an ineffable manner, his Lord Himself, "dwelleth" (our Lord says) "in Me and I in Him," and having Christ within him[k], not only *shall* he *have*, but he "*hath*" already "eternal Life," because he hath Him Who is "the Only True God and Eternal Life[l];" and so Christ "will raise him up at the last Day," because he hath His life in him. Receiving Him into this very body[m], they who are His,

into Me, Who am able to give life, because I am, as it were, of the life-giving Root, that is, God the Father." S. Cyril in S. Joh. l. iv. c. 3 init. p. 366. ed. Aub.

[k] "So receive the Holy Communion, believing that it hath power of expelling not death only, but the diseases in us, [i. e. in the soul.] For Christ *thus coming to be in us*, (ἐν ἡμῖν γεγονὼς,) lulleth in us the law which rageth in the members of the flesh, and kindleth carefulness to Godward, and deadeneth passions, &c. S. Cyr. in S. Joh. 6, 56. p. 365. "He saith, he that eateth My Flesh dwelleth in Me, shewing that He is mingled in him (ἐν αὐτῷ ἀνακιρνᾶται)." S. Chrys. Hom. 47 in S. Joh. §. 1. "Thou hast, not the Cherubim, but the Lord Himself of the Cherubim indwelling, not the pot, nor the manna, the tables of stone and Aaron's rod, but the Body and Blood of the Lord." S. Chrys. in Ps. 133. "Thou art about to receive the King within thee (ὑποδέχεσθαι) by communion. When the King entereth the soul, there ought to be a great calm." S. Chrys. de B. Philog. fin.

[l] See S. Cyr. ib. p. 363.

[m] "Why do we receive it [the Holy Eucharist] within us? Is it not that it may make Christ to dwell in us corporeally also (ἆρ' οὐχὶ καὶ σωματικῶς ἡμῖν ἐνοικίζουσα τὸν Χριστὸν), by participation and communion of His Holy Flesh? For S. Paul says that the Gentiles are embodied (σύσσωμα) with, and coheirs, and copartakers of Christ? How are they shewn to be 'embodied?' Because being admitted to share the Holy Eucharist, they become one body with Him, just as each one of the holy Apostles. For why did he [S. Paul] call his own, yea, the members of all, as well as his own, the members of Christ? (1 Cor. vi. 15.) And the Saviour Himself saith, 'Whoso eateth My

receive life, which shall pass over to our very decaying flesh; they have within them Him Who is Life and Immortality and Incorruption, to cast out or absorb into itself our natural mortality and death and corruption, and "shall live for ever," because made one with Him Who Alone "liveth for evermore." It is not then life only as an outward gift, to be possessed by us, as His gift; it is no *mere* strengthening and refreshing of our souls, by the renewal[n] and confirming our wills, and invigorating of our moral nature, giving us more fixedness of purpose, or implanting in us Christian graces; it is no gift, such as we might imagine given to the most perfect of God's created beings in himself. Picture we the most perfect wisdom, knowledge, strength, harmony, proportion, brightness, beauty, fitness, completeness of created being; fair as was

Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me and I in Him.' For here it is especially to be observed, that Christ saith that He shall be in us, not by a certain relation only as entertained through the affections, but also by a natural participation. For as, if one entwineth wax with other wax, and melteth them by the fire, there resulteth of both one, (ἕν τι) so through the participation of the Body of Christ and of His precious Blood, He in us, and we again in Him, are co-united. For in no other way could that which is by nature corruptible be made alive, unless it were bodily entwined with the Body of That Which is by nature Life, the Only-Begotten, (εἰ μὴ συνεπλάκη σωματικῶς τῷ σώματι τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ζωῆς, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τοῦ Μονογενοῦς.) And if any be not persuaded by my words, give credence to Christ Himself, crying aloud, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat, &c.' (S. Joh. vi. 53, 54.) Thou hearest now Himself plainly declaring, that, unless we 'eat His Flesh and drink His Blood,' we 'have not in ourselves,' that is, in our flesh, 'Eternal Life;' but Eternal Life may be conceived to be, and most justly, the Flesh of That Which is Life, that is, the Only-Begotten." S. Cyr. in S. Joh. 15, l. l. x. c. 2. p. 862, 3. "How say they that the flesh goeth to corruption, and partaketh not of life, which is nourished by the Body of the Lord and by His Blood. Our doctrine agreeth with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirmeth our doctrine. For as bread out of the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the Resurrection for ever." S. Iren. 4. 18. 5. comp. S. Greg. Nyss. (very fully) Catech. Orat. c. 37. t. iii. p. 102.

[n] But, in the words of our Catechism, "by the Body and Blood of Christ," i. e. by receiving them.

that angel "in the garden of God" before he fell, "the seal of comeliness, full of wisdom, and complete in beauty—perfect in his ways from the day he was created[o]." Yet let this be a perfection, upheld indeed of God, yet external to Him, as a mere creation, and it would fall unutterably short of the depth of the mystery of the Sacraments of Christ, and the gift, the germ whereof is therein contained for us; although such as we actually are, we know that, for strength we have weakness, for knowledge ignorance, our nature jarring still, disharmonized, obscured, deformed, both by the remains of original corruption and our own superadded sins. For the life therein bestowed is greater than any gift, since it is life in Christ, life through His indwelling, Himself Who is Life. And Holy Scripture hints, that the blessed Angels, who never fell, shall in some way to us unknown, gain by the mystery of the Incarnation, being with us gathered together under One Head, our Incarnate Lord, into His One Body[p], the fulness of Him Who filleth all in all. Certainly, Scripture seems to imply, that, although He "took not the nature of angels" but "of man," yet all created beings, "thrones and dominions and principalities and powers," shall, if one may reverently say it, be more filled with God, when, this His body being perfected, there shall be no check or hindrance to the full effluence of His Divine Nature, circulating through the whole Body, into which He shall have "knit things in heaven and things in earth," "the innumerable company of the Angels," and "the just made perfect;" and the whole glorified Church shall be clothed and radiant with Him, the Sun of Righteousness.

[o] Ezek. xxviii. 12, 15.

[p] "I say more, even angels and virtues and the higher powers are confederated in this one Church, as the Apostle teaches that in Christ all things are reconciled, not only things in earth, but things in heaven." S. Nicetæ Expl. Symb. p. 44. (quoted Manning, Unity of the Church, p. 37.)

And of this we have the germs and first beginnings now. This is (if we may reverently so speak) the order of the mystery of the Incarnation[p], that the Eternal Word so took our flesh into Himself, as to impart to it His own inherent life; so then we, partaking of It, that life is transmitted on to us also, and not to our souls only, but our bodies[q] also, since we become flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone[r], and He Who is wholly life is imparted to us wholly[s]. The Life which He is, spreads around, first giving Its own vitality to that sinless Flesh which He united indissolubly with

p "Doth any man doubt but that even from the flesh of Christ our very bodies do receive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day, and for which they are already accounted parts of His blessed Body? Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with His Body which is incorruptible, and that His is in ours as a cause of immortality, a cause by removing through the death and merit of His own flesh that which hindered the life of ours. Christ is therefore both as God and as man that true vine whereof we both spiritually and corporally are branches. The mixture of His bodily substance with ours is a thing which the ancient fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of His flesh with ours they speak of, to signify what our very bodies through mystical conjunction receive from that vital efficacy which we know to be in His; and from bodily mixtures they borrow diverse similitudes rather to declare the truth, than the manner of coherence between His sacred and the sanctified bodies of saints." Hooker, H. E. v. 56. 9. The thoughtful study of these chapters of Hooker on the connection of the Sacraments with the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord would do much, in pious minds, to remove existing difficulties in the reception of the truth.

q "The Holy Body then of Christ giveth life to those in whom It is and keepeth them from incorruption, mingled (ἀνακιρνάμενον) with our bodies. For we know it to be the Body of no other than of Him Who is, by Nature, Life, having in Itself the whole Virtue of the united Word, and in-qualitied as it were, (πεποιωμένον) yea rather filled with His mighty working, whereby all things are made alive and kept in being." S. Cyr. in S. Joh. 6, 35. l. iii. c. 6. p. 324.

r S. Chrys. Hom. 46. in S. Joh. §. 2 fin. "Wherefore we needs ought to learn what is the miracle (θαῦμα) of the Mysteries, why they were given, and what their benefit. We become one body, members, he saith, of His Flesh and of His Bones." Add. §. 3. See also Mede and others, App.

s "If they who touched the hem of His garment drew such great virtue, how much more they who possess Him wholly (οἱ ὅλον αὐτὸν κατέχοντες)." S. Chrys. Hom. 50. in S. Matt. §. 2.

Himself and in It encircling and vivifying our whole nature, and then, through that bread which is His Flesh, finding an entrance to us individually, penetrating us, soul and body, and spirit, and irradiating and transforming into His own light and life. In the words of a father[t] who in warfare with the Nestorian heresy, lived in the mystery of the Incarnation, "He is life by nature, inasmuch as He was Begotten of the Living Father; but no less vivifying also is His Holy Body, being in a matter brought together (συνηνεγμένον) and ineffably united with the all-vivifying Word; wherefore It is accounted His, and is conceived as one with Him. For, since the Incarnation, it is inseparable; save that we know that the Word which came from God the Father, and the Temple from the Virgin, are not indeed the same in nature; for the Body is not consubstantial with the Word from God, yet is one by that ineffable coming-together and concurrence; and since the Flesh of the Saviour became life-giving, as being united to That which is by nature Life, The Word from God, then, when we taste It, we have life in ourselves, we too being united with It, as It to the indwelling Word." "I then[u], He saith, being in him will by Mine own Flesh raise up him who eateth thereof, in the last Day. For since Christ is in us by His own Flesh, we must altogether rise, for it were incredible, yea rather, impossible, that Life should not make alive those in whom It is." To add the words of one father only of the Western Church, ever had in honour, as well for his sufferings for the faith, as for his well-weighed and reverent language. S. Hilary[x] adduced the

[t] S. Cyril Alex. in S. Joh. l. iv. c. 2. in v. 54. p. 361. The words just preceding are, on v. 24. "For wholly destitute of all share and taste of that life which is in sanctification and bliss, are they who do not through the mystical Communion (εὐλογίαι) receive the Son."

[u] Id. in v. 55. p. 363.

[x] De Trin. viii. 13.

very actualness of this union in proof against the Arians, that the unity of the Father and the Son, was not of will but of nature, because our union with the Son is by unity of nature, not of harmony of will only. "For if the Word was truly made Flesh, and we, in the Supper of the Lord, truly receive the Word, being Flesh, how must He not be thought to abide in us, by the way of nature, Who, being born man, took to Himself the Nature of our flesh, now inseparable from Him, and under the Sacrament of the Flesh which is to be communicated to us, hath mingled the Nature of His own Flesh with His eternal Nature. So then, we are all one, because both the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us. Whosoever then shall deny that the Father is in Christ by way of Nature, let him first deny that himself is by way of nature in Christ or Christ in Him; because the Father in Christ and Christ in us, make us to be one in them. If then Christ truly took the Nature of our Body, and that Man, Who was born of Mary, is truly Christ, and we truly, under a mystery, receive the Flesh of His Body, (and thereby shall become one, because the Father is in Him and He in us,) how is it asserted that the Unity is of will only, whereas the natural property (conveyed) through the Sacrament is the Sacrament of a perfect unity?" And a little after[y], alleging our Blessed Lord's words, "My Flesh is truly meat, My Blood is truly drink." "Of the truth of the Flesh and Blood, there is no room left for doubt. For now, according both to the declaration of the Lord and our faith, It is truly Flesh and truly Blood. And these, received into us, cause, that we are in Christ and Christ in us. Is not this truth? Be it not truth to those who deny that Christ Jesus is true God. He then is in us through the flesh, and we are in Him, since this, which we are, is with Him in God."

[y] Ib. §. 14.

Would that, instead of vain and profane disputings, we could but catch the echoes of these hallowed sounds, and forgetting the jarrings of our earthly discords, live in this harmony and unity of Heaven, where, through and in our Lord, we are all one in God. Would that, borne above ourselves, we could be caught up within the influence of the mystery of that ineffable love whereby the Father would draw us to that oneness with Him in His Son, which is the perfection of eternal bliss, where will, thought, affections shall be one, because we shall be, by communication of His Divine Nature, one. Yet such is undoubted Catholic teaching, and the most literal import of Holy Scripture, and the mystery of the Sacrament, that the Eternal Word, Who is God, having taken to Him our flesh and joined it indissolubly with Himself, and so, where His Flesh is, there He is[z], and we receiving it, receive Him, and receiving Him are joined on to Him through His flesh to the Father, and He dwelling in us, dwell in Him, and with Him in God. "I," He saith, "in the Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." This is the perfection after which all the rational creation groans, this for which the Church, which hath the first fruits of the Spirit, groaneth within herself, yea this for which our Lord Himself tarrieth, that His yet imperfect members advancing onwards in Him[a], and the whole multitude of the Redeemed being gathered into the One Body, His whole Body should, in Him, be perfected in the Unity of the Father. And so is He also, as Man, truly the Mediator between God and Man, in that being as God, One with the Father, as man, one with us, we truly are in Him who is truly in the Father. He, by the truth of the Sacrament,

[z] "Where His Body is, there Christ is. When the adversary shall see thy dwelling-place (hospitium) filled with the brightness of the heavenly Presence," &c. S. Ambr. in Ps. 118. §. 8. 48.

[a] S. Aug. in Ps. 138. §. 21. Serm. 135. de verb. Ev. Joh. 9. c. 5. comp. S. Hil. de Trin. xi. 49. (quoted Tract on Holy Baptism, p. 180. ed. 3.)

dwelleth in us, in Whom, by Nature, all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth; and lowest is joined on with highest, earth with heaven, corruption with incorruption, man with God.

But where, one may feel, is there here any place for the sinner? Here all breathes of holy life, life in God, the life of God imparted to man, the indwelling of the All Holy and Incarnate Word, the Presence of God in the soul and body, incorruption and eternal life, through His Holy Presence and union with Him, Who, being God, is Life. Where seems there room for one, the mansion of whose soul has been broken down, and he to have no place where Christ may lay His head[b]; the vessel has been broken, if not defiled, and now seems unfit to contain God's Holy Presence; the tenement has been narrowed by self-love, and seems incapable of expanding to receive the love of God, or God Who is love; or choked and thronged with evil or foul imaginations; or luxury and self indulgence have dissolved it, or evil thoughts and desires have made room for evil spirits in that which was the dwelling-place of the Trinity?

Doubtless, God's highest and "holy" gift, is as the Ancient Church proclaimed, chiefly "for the holy." "Ye cannot be partakers of the Table of the Lord, and the table of devils." And as Holy Scripture, so also the Ancient Church, when alluding to the fruits of this ineffable gift, speak of them mostly as they would be to those, who, on earth, already live in Heaven, and on Him Who is its life and bliss. They speak of those "clothed in flesh and blood, drawing nigh to the blessed and immortal nature[c];"

[b] Bp. Andrewes' Devotions for Holy Communion, (from ancient Liturgies,) "O Lord, I am not worthy, I am not fit, that Thou shouldest come under the roof of my soul; for it is all desolate and ruined; nor hast Thou in me fitting place to lay Thy head."

[c] S. Chrys. de Sacerdot. iii. 5. add. in die Nat. J. C. t. 2. p. 305. "consider that, being earth and ashes, thou receivest the Body and Blood of Christ

of "spiritual fire[d];" "grace[e] exceeding human thought and a gift unutterable;" "spiritual food[f], surpassing all creation visible and invisible," "kindling[g] the souls of all and making them brighter than silver purified by the fire;" "removing[h] us from earth, transferring us to heaven," "making angels for men, so that it were a wonder that man should think he were yet on earth[i]," yea, more than angels, "becoming that which we receive[k], the Body of Christ." For that so we are "members[l] of Him, not by love only, but in very deed, mingled with that Flesh, mingled with Him, that we might become in a manner one

—now when God inviteth thee to His own Table, and setteth before thee His own Son,—let us draw near as approaching to the King of Heaven."

[d] De Beat. Philog. Hom. vi. t. i. p. 500. ed. Ben. de Pœnit. Hom. 9. init. S. Ephr. Opp. Syr. t. iii. p. 23.

[e] S. Chrys. in Ps. 133.

[f] S. Chrys. de Bapt. Christi fin.

[g] "This Blood is the salvation of our souls; by this the soul is washed; by this beautified; by this kindled; this maketh our mind gleam more than fire; this maketh the soul brighter than gold." S. Chrys. in S. Joh. Hom. 46. §. 3. add de Sac. iii. 4.

[h] S. Chrys. in S. Matt. Hom. 25. §. 3.

[i] S. Chrys. de Bapt. Christi fin. t. ii. p. 374.

[k] S. Aug. Serm. 227. ad Inf. de Sacr.

[l] S. Chrys. Hom. 46. in S. Joh. §. 3. "But that we may be thus [one body, members of His Flesh and of His Bones,] not through love only, but in very truth, be we mingled with that Flesh. For this taketh place through the Food He gave us, wishing to shew the longing He hath towards us, wherefore He hath mingled Himself with us, and blended (ἀνέφυρε) His Body with us, that we might be in a manner one substance (ἕν τι) as the body joined to the head;" and in S. Matt. Hom. 82. §. 5. "It sufficed not to Him to become man, nor to be buffetted and slain, but He mingleth Himself also with us, and not by faith only, but in very deed maketh us His Body." "For as if one joineth wax with wax, he will see the one in the other, in like manner, I deem, he who receiveth the Flesh of our Saviour Christ, and drinketh His precious Blood, as He saith, is found as one substance with Him, (ἓν ὡς πρὸς αὐτὸν) commingled as it were and immingled with Him (συναναμιγνάμενος ὥσπερ καὶ ἀναμιγνύμενος αὐτῷ,) through the participation, so that he is found in Christ, and Christ again in him.—As then Paul saith that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, so the least portion of the consecrated elements blendeth (ἀναφύρει) our whole body with itself, and filleth it with its own mighty working, and thus Christ cometh to be in us and we in Him." S. Cyr. in S. Joh. 6, 57. p. 364, 5. S. Cyril again uses the word ἀνακιρναμένους. ib. p. 351.

substance with Him," "the one Body and one Flesh of Christ[m];" and He the Eternal Son and God the Word in us, "commingled[n] and co-united with us," with our bodies as with our souls, preserving both for incorruption; "re-creating the spirit in us, to newness of life, and making us 'partakers of His Divine Nature;'" "the bond of our unity with the Father, binding us to Himself as Man," Who is "by nature, as God, in God His own Father;" "descending to our nature subject to corruption and to change, and raising it to Its own excellencies," and "by commingling it with Itself, all but removing it from the conditions of created Nature," and "re-forming it according to Itself." "We are," adds S. Cyril, "perfected into unity with God the Father, through Christ the Mediator. For having received into ourselves, bodily and spiritually, Him Who is by Nature and truly the Son, Who hath an essential Oneness with Him, we, becoming partakers of the Nature Which is above all, are glorified." "We," says another[o],

[m] S. Chrys. in S. Matt. Hom. 82. §. 5. "That whereat the Angels gaze with awe, thereby are we nourished, therewith are we mingled, and we become the one body and the one flesh of Christ." add. S. Cyr. Jer. Lect. 22. §. 3.

[n] The whole passage stands thus in S. Cyril, (in S. Joh. 17, 23. l. xi. c. 12. p. 1001.) "We are united [not only with each other but] with God also. And how, the Lord Himself hath explained. 'I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected in one (εἰς ἓν).' For the Son is in us corporeally as Man, commingled and co-united with us (συναναχιρνάμενός τε καὶ συνενούμενος) by the Holy Eucharist. And again spiritually as God, by the power and grace of His own Spirit, re-creating the spirit in us to newness of life, and making us partakers of the Divine Nature. Christ then appeareth to be the bond of our unity with God the Father, binding us to Himself, as Man, but being, as God, in God His own Father. For in no other way could the nature, subject to corruption, rise aloft to incorruption, unless the Nature, superior to all corruption and change, had descended to it, lightening in a manner that which ever sunk downwards, and raising it to Its own excellencies, and by communion and commingling with Itself all but uplifting it from the conditions conformable to created nature, and re-forming according to Itself that which is not so of Itself. We are &c. [as in the text.] For Christ willeth that we be received into the oneness with God the Father."

[o] S. Cyr. Jer. l. c.

"come to bear Christ in us, His Body and Blood being diffused through our members; whence, saith St. Peter, we become 'partakers of the Divine Nature.'"

Yet although most which is spoken belongs to Christians as belonging already to the household of saints and the family of Heaven and the Communion of Angels and unity with God, still, here as elsewhere in the New Testament, there is a subordinate and subdued notion of sin; and what wraps the Saint already in the third Heaven, may yet uphold us sinners, that the pit shut not her mouth upon us. The same reality of the Divine Gift makes It Angels' food to the Saint, the ransom to the sinner. And both because It is the Body and Blood of Christ. Were it *only* a thankful commemoration of His redeeming love, or *only* a shewing forth of His Death, or a strengthening *only* and refreshing of the soul, it were indeed a reasonable service, but it would have no direct healing for the sinner. To him its special joy is that it is His Redeemer's very[p] broken[q] Body, It is His Blood, which was shed for the remission of his sins. In the words of the ancient Church, he "drinks his ransom[r]," he eateth that, "the very Body and Blood of the Lord, the only Sacrifice for sin[s]," God "poureth out" for him yet "the most precious Blood of His Only-Begotten[t];" they "are fed from the Cross of the Lord, because they

[p] S. Chrys. in S. Joh. Hom. 46. §. 3. "I willed to become your Brother; I became partaker of Flesh and Blood for your sake; again, that same Flesh and Blood, whereby I became akin to you, I give forth to you." S. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. §. 7. "They [the Docetæ] abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is that Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, which by His loving-kindness the Father raised." Comp. Bp. Taylor. (App.)

[q] See S. Chrys. below, p. 21. Liturgies, p. 24. Bp. Taylor. (App.)

[r] S. Aug. Conf. l. 10. fin. "pretii nostri Sacramentum," ib. l. 9. §. 36. add. Serm. 9. §. 14. S. 131. init. and in Ps. 48. S. 1. §. 3. and in Ps. 125. §. 9.

[s] S. Aug. c. Cresc. Don. i. 25.

[t] S. Aug. Serm. 216. §. 3. "whom He accounteth so dear, that for you He poureth out daily &c."

eat His Body and Blood[u];" and as of the Jews of old, even those who had been the betrayers and murderers of their Lord, it was said, "the Blood[x], which in their phrenzy they shed, believing they drank," so of the true penitent it may be said, whatever may have been his sins, so he could repent, awful as it is to say,—the Blood he in deed despised, and profaned, and trampled under foot, may he, when himself humbled in the dust, drink, and therein drink his salvation. "He[y] Who refused not to shed His Blood for us, and again gave us of His Flesh and His very Blood, what will He refuse for our salvation?" "He," says S. Ambrose[z], "is the Bread of life. Whoso then eateth life cannot die. How should he die, whose food is life? How perish, who hath a living substance? Approach to Him and be filled, because He is Bread; approach to Him and drink, because He is a Fountain; approach to Him and be enlightened, because He is Light; approach to Him and be freed, because, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; approach to Him and be absolved, because He is Remission of sins."

In each place in Holy Scripture, where the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is taught, there is, at least, some indication of the remission of sins. Our Blessed Lord, while chiefly speaking of Himself, as the Bread of life, the true meat, the true drink, His Indwelling, Resurrection

[u] S. Aug. in Ps. 100, 9.

[x] S. Aug. Serm. 77. 4. add. Serm. 80. 5. fin. S. 87. 14. S. 89. 1. S. 352, 2. in Ps. 45. §. 4. and in Ps. 65. §. 5. add. S. Chrys. de Prod. Jud. Hom. 2. §. 3. "This is My Blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins. And Judas was present when the Lord said this. This is the Blood, which thou didst sell for thirty pieces of silver.—Oh how great the lovingkindness of Christ! oh, what the ingratitude of Judas! The Lord nourished, the servant sold. For he sold Him, receiving the thirty pieces of silver; Christ shed His own Blood as a ransom for us, and gave It to him, who sold Him, had he willed. For Judas also was present before the betrayal, and partook of the Holy Table, and received the mystical Feast."

[y] S. Chrys. ad Pop. Ant. ii. fin.

[z] In Ps. 118. lit. 18. §. 28.

from the dead, and Life everlasting, still says also, "the Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." As amid the apparent identity of this teaching, each separate oracle enounces some fresh portion of the whole truth, so also does this; that His Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament shall give life, not only because they are the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Word, Who is Life, but also because they are the very Flesh and Blood which were given and shed for the life of the world, and are given *to* those, *for* whom [a] they had been given. This is said yet more distinctly in the awful words, whereby He consecrated for ever [b] elements of this world to be His Body and Blood. It has been remarked [c], as that which cannot be incidental, (as how should any words

[a] S. Chrys. in S. Matt. Hom. 25. §. 3. "If of His Birth it is said 'all this,' what shall we say of His being crucified, and shedding His Blood for us, and giving Himself to us for a spiritual feast and banquet?" S. Cyr. in S. Joh. vi. 51. lib. iv. c. 2. p. 354. "Christ then gave His own Body for the life of all, but again through It He maketh life to dwell in us (ἐνοικίζει); and how, I will say as I am able. For when the life-giving Word of God dwelt in the flesh, He transformed it into His own proper good, i. e. life, and by the unspeakable character of this union coming wholly together with it made It life-giving, as Himself is by Nature. Wherefore the Body of Christ giveth life to all who partake of It, for It expels death when It entereth those subject to death, and removeth corruption, producing by Itself perfectly (τελείως ὠδῖνον ἐν ἑαυτῷ) that Word which abolisheth corruption." S. Cypr. Ep. ad Cæcil. init. "His Blood whereby we were redeemed and brought to life cannot seem to be in the Cup, when wine is wanting to the Cup, whereby the Blood of Christ is set forth." S. Clem. Al. Pæd. ii. 2. v. fin. "He blessed wine when He said, Take, drink, this is My Blood, the blood of the vine; for the Word, Which is poured forth for many for the remission of sins, he calls in image, the holy fountain of joy."

[b] S. Chrys. de Prodit. Jud. Hom. i. 6. "As that voice, 'increase and be multiplied,' was uttered once, but throughout all time doth in act enable our race to produce children, so also that voice [This is My Body], once spoken, doth, on every Table in the Churches, from that time until this day, and until His Coming, make the Sacrifice perfect."

[c] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, c. 2. s. 1. p. 85 sqq. Of Roman Catholic Divines it is maintained by Jansenius ad Concordiam Evang. c. 13. and others quoted by Vazquez (qu. 78. art. 3. Disp. 99. c. 1.), rejected by Vazquez (ib.)

of the Eternal Word be incidental?) how amid lesser variations in the order or fulness of those solemn words, they still, wherever recorded, speak of the act as a present act. "This is My Body which *is* given for you;" "This is My Body which *is* broken for you;" "This is My Blood of the New Testament which *is* shed for many for the remission of sins;" "This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which *is* shed for you." He saith not, "which shall be given," "shall be broken," "shall be shed," but "is being given," "being broken," "being shed," (διδόμενον, κλώμενον, ἐκχυνόμενον,) and this in remarkable contrast with His own words, when speaking of that same Gift, as yet future, "The Bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give (ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω) for the life of the world." And of one of the words used, S. Chrysostome[d] remarks how it could not be said of the Cross, but is true of the Holy Eucharist. "For 'a bone of Him,' it saith, 'shall not be broken.' But that which He suffered not on the Cross, this He suffers in the oblation for thy sake, and submits to be broken that He may fill all men." Hereby He seems as well to teach us that the great Act of His Passion then began; then, as a Priest, did He through the Eternal Spirit offer Himself without spot to God; then did He "consecrate" Himself[e], before

[d] Hom. 24 in 1 Cor. §. 4. The comment is immediately on c. 10, 16. ("the Bread Which we break," τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν,) where he chiefly dwells on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It of course more strongly applies to the words themselves, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον.

[e] S. John xvii. 19. "What meaneth 'I sanctify Myself?' I offer Thee a sacrifice; but all the sacrifices are called 'holy;' and properly, 'holy' are what are dedicated to God." S. Chrys. ad loc. Hom. 82. §. 1. "That, according to the usage of the law is said to be sanctified, which is by any one brought unto God, as a gift or offering, such as every first-born which openeth the womb among the children of Israel. For He saith unto Moses, 'sanctify unto Me &c.' i. e. dedicate, set apart, write down as holy.—Taking, then, according to usage, 'sanctify' as meaning 'to dedicate and set apart,' we say that the Son 'sanctified' Himself for us. For He offered Himself, as a Sacrifice and holy Offering to God The Father, reconciling the world unto Him, &c." S. Cyr. ad loc. l. xi. c. 10. p. 989.

He was by wicked hands crucified and slain[f]; and all which followed, until He commended His Blessed Spirit to the Hands of His Heavenly Father, was One protracted, willing, Suffering. Then did He begin His lonely journey, where there was none to help or uphold, but He "travelled in the greatness of His strength;" then did He begin to "tread the wine-press alone," and to "stain all His raiment;" then to "wash the garments" of His Humanity "with" the "Wine" of His Blood[g]; and therefore does the Blood bedew us too; it cleanses us, because it is the Blood shed for the remission of our sins[h]. And this may have been another truth, which our Lord intended to convey to us, when He pronounced the words as the form which consecrates the sacramental elements into His Body and Blood, that that Precious Blood is still, in continuance[i] and appli-

[f] "He Who disposeth all things according to His supreme Will awaiteth not the compulsion from the Betrayal, nor the violent assault of the Jews, and the lawless judgment of Pilate, so that their malice should be the beginning and cause of the common salvation of man; but by this dispensation He anticipateth their assault according to the mode of His Priestly Act, ineffable and invisible to man, and offered Himself as an Offering and Sacrifice for us, Priest at once and The Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sins of the world." S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. i. in Christi Res. t. iii. p. 389. add S. Cypr. Ep. 63. ad Cæcil. Theodoret in Ps. 109. S. Aug. de Doctr. Christ. iv. 21.

[g] Gen. xlix. 11. is explained of the Passion of Christ by Justin M. Apol. 1. p. 71. ed. Par. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 273. Tert. adv. Marc. v. 40. S. Ambr. de Jos. §. 13. de bened. Pat. §. 24. S. James of Edess. ap. S. Ephr. ad loc. (as v. 12. is by S. Jerome in Is. l. 15. c. 55.) of His Blood, Clem. Al. Pædag. l. i. p. 126. Orig. Hom. 17 in Jud. and by Orig. also of the Holy Eucharist, as also by S. Cypr. Ep. 63. S. Aug. de Civ. D. xvi. 41.

[h] "That you may eat the Body of the Lord Jesus, wherein is remission of sins, the imploring of Divine reconciliation and everlasting protection." S. Ambr. in Ps. 118. Litt. 8. §. 48. "He receiveth who examineth himself, but whoso receiveth shall not die the sinner's death, for this Bread is the remission of sins." Id. de Bened. Patr. c. 9.

[i] "This word ['sufficient Sacrifice'] refers to the Sacrifice mentioned before, for we still *continue* and commemorate that Sacrifice, which Christ once made upon the Cross." (Notes from the Collections of Bp. Overall, ap. Nicholl's Comm. additional notes; see more at length Tract No. 80.) "What then? Do not we [Christians] daily offer? We do offer, but making a Memorial of His Death. And this is one and not many. How one and not many? Because it was once offered, as was that which was brought into the

cation of His One Oblation once made upon the Cross, poured out for us now, conveying to our souls, as being His Blood, with the other benefits of His Passion, the remission of our sins also. And so, when St. Paul says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the participation of the Blood of Christ?" remission of sins is implied by the very words. For, if we be indeed partakers of His atoning Blood, how should we not be partakers of its fruits? "That which is in the Cup," S. Chrysostome paraphrases[k], "is that which flowed from His side, and of that do we partake." How should we approach His Sacred Side, and remain leprous still? Touching with our very lips that cleansing Blood[l], how may we not, with the Ancient Church[m], confess, "Lo, this hath touched my

Holy of Holies. This is a type of that, and this itself of That. For we always offer The Same (τὸν αὐτὸν); not now one animal, to-morrow another, but always the same thing. So then the sacrifice is one. Else since it is offered in many places, there were many Christs. But no. There is but One Christ every where, here fully and there fully, One Body. As then He, being offered in many places, is One Body, and not many bodies, so also there is One Sacrifice. Our High Priest is He, Who offered the Sacrifice which cleanseth us. That same Sacrifice which was then also offered, we offer now too, That, the inexhaustible. For this is for a Memorial of That Which took place then. For, He saith, 'This do, as a Memorial of Me.' We do not make a different, but always the same Sacrifice; or rather we make a memorial of that Sacrifice." (S. Chrys. Hom. 17 on Heb. 9, 28. "Christ was once offered.")

[k] ad loc.

[l] "His Blood is there received, His Flesh distributed to the salvation of the people; His Blood poured out, not now on the hands of the unbelievers, but into the mouths of the faithful." S. Greg. Dial. iv. 58. "While the Blood in the Cup is being poured out (κενουμένου) out of the undefiled Side." S. Chrys. de Pœnit. init. S. Chrys. also speaks of "the tongue reddened" (φοινισσομένην) "with the most aweful Blood," in S. Matt. Hom. 82. §. 5. and de Sac. iii. 4. p. 382. "Thou seest all reddened with that precious Blood;" and in Ps. 140. §. 4. t. 5. p. 433. "Think that this [the tongue] is the member, whereby we hold converse with God—this the member whereby we receive the aweful Sacrifice." comp. Hooker, (App.) "We are dyed red within and without;" and in Bp. Wilson, (App.) "seeing the Blood of the true Paschal Lamb upon your lips."

[m] The coal from the altar is regarded as a type of the Holy Eucharist by S. Chrys. in illud Vide Dom. Hom. 5. §. 3. t. vi. p. 141. "And what marvel, if

lips, and shall take away mine iniquities and cleanse my sins[n]?"

There is, accordingly, an entire agreement in the Eucharistic Liturgies of the universal Church, in prayer, in benediction, in declaration, confessing that in the Holy Eucharist there is forgiveness of sins also. Those of S. James[o] and S. Mark[p] so paraphrase the words of Consecration as to develope the sense that they relate not only to the past act of His Precious Bloodshedding on the Cross, but to the communication of that Blood to us now. "This is My Body which for you is broken

thou standest with the Seraphim, since those things which the Seraphim dared not touch, these God hath given thee with all confidence. For he saith, 'There was sent to me one of the Seraphim, having a coal of fire, which he took with the tongs from the altar.' That altar is an image and likeness of the Altar; that fire, of this spiritual fire; but the Seraphim dared not touch it with the hand, but with the tongs, but thou receivest It in the hand. Were you indeed to regard the dignity of what is there placed, (τῶν προκειμένων) it is far too great for the touch of the Seraphim—and ad loc. §. 4. Ib. p. 69. as the exposition of others, when himself giving the primary meaning, "Some say that these things are the symbols of the Mysteries which were to come, the Altar, the fire lying thereon, the ministering power, its being placed in the mouth, the cleansing of sins." See also de Pœn. Hom. 9. t. ii. p. 350. ed. Ben. "Wherefore also, when ye approach, think not that ye receive the Divine Body, as from man, but, as from the Seraphim themselves with the tongs of fire which Isaias saw, think that ye receive the Divine Body; and as touching with the lips the Divine and Unpolluted Side, so let us receive the Saving Blood." Theodoret, ad loc. "placing the coal on the mouth of the prophet, he declared to him the remission of sin. But by these things is moreover described and pre-typified the participation of our blessings, the remission of sins through the Body and Blood of the Lord." add. S. Ephr. Serm. 10. adv. Scrutat. Opp. Syr. t. iii. p. 23. S. James Doct. ap. S. Ephr. Opp. ad loc. t. ii. p. 30. et al. ib. See also lit. of S. Cyril, (Renaudot. Liturg. tom. ii. 49.) Coptic (ib. p. 54.) Renaudot (p. 195.) mentions a sacred vessel, in use among the Greeks and Copts, called hence the ἁγία λάβις, and suggests (ib. p. 323.) that the title spiritual 'fire,' frequent in Greek hymns on the Holy Eucharist, refers to this type, (see S. Chrys. ab. p. 16. and in this note.)

[n] Lit. of S. Chrys. p. 83. ed. Goar. comp. Lit. of S. James Ass. Cod. Lit. v. 56. "The Lord bless us and make us worthy to take with the pure 'tongs' of our hands the fiery coal and to place it on the mouths of the faithful, for the cleansing and purifying of their souls and bodies, now and ever."

[o] Greek, (Ass. Cod. Lit. v. 36.) Syriac, (ib. p. 236.) Armenian, (Renaud. Litt. Orr. ii. 127.)

[p] Greek, (Ass. vii. 32, 33. 58. 104.) Coptic, (141, 2. ib.)

and given for the remission of sins." "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which for you and for many is poured out and given for the remission of sins." Again, the Liturgies join together, manifoldly, remission of sins and life eternal, as the two great fruits of this Sacrament. Thus in the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost on the sacred elements [q], "that they may be to all who partake of them to the remission of sins, and to life eternal;" or in intercession [r], "that we may become meet to be partakers of Thy holy mysteries to the remission of sins and life eternal," or in the words of communicating [s], "I give thee the precious and holy and undefiled Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and life eternal." And the prayer in our own liturgy is almost in the very words of an Eastern [t] and in the character of a Western

[q] Lit. of S. James, (Ass. v. 40.) S. Mark, (ib. vii. 60 add. p. 35.) Lit. of S. Gregory, (ib. 106, 7.) Syriac, (ib. 190, 1.) Coptic, (ib. 143, 4.) Const. Ap. viii. 12. Lit. of S. Chrys. (Goar. p. 77.)

[r] Lit. of S. James, (Ass. v. 52.) Post-Comm. Const. Ap. viii. 14. S. Basil from S. James, Ass. vii. 46. "for the remission of sins, for the communication of the Holy Spirit." S. Mark, ib. vii. 73. It is retained in the Nestorian lit. Ren. ii. 634. "May Thy Living Body, O Lord, which we have eaten, and Thy pure Blood which we have drunk, not be to us, Lord, to hurt or weakness, but to the expiation of offences and blotting out of sins, Lord of all;" and p. 635. (benediction,) "To Him, Who expiates our offences by His Body, and doeth away our sins by His Blood, be praise in His Church;" and, Gallic-Goth. Liturg. Post-Comm. (Mabillon de Lit. Gall. p. 300.) "Thy Body crucified for us we have eaten, and Thy Holy Blood shed for us we have drunk; may Thy Holy Body be to us to salvation and Thy Holy Blood for remission of sins here and for eternal ages." Armenian, ap. Ren. ii. 12. "Let not this Mystery which was instituted for our salvation, become to us to judgment, but to the abolition of our sins, &c." Miss. Mixt. Mozarab. p. 233. ed. Lesl. "Tasting, Lord, the fulness of [Thy] sweetness, we pray that this be to us for the remission of sins and the health of our minds;" and the priest for himself, "O Lord, my God, grant me so to receive the Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that by It I may obtain remission of all my sins, and be filled with Thy Holy Spirit." (ib. p. 232.)

[s] Lit. of S. Chrys. Goar. p. 82, 83.

[t] "Vouchsafe to us, O Lord God, that our bodies may be sanctified by Thy Holy Body, and our souls cleansed by Thy propitiating Blood, and that it may be to us forgiveness of our debts and pardon of our sins." Supplem. to Syriac

Liturgy[u], "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed by His most precious Blood." Even the Roman Liturgy, though less full on this point, has prayers, "that[v] the Communion may cleanse us from sin," "may be the washing away of guilt, the remission of all offences[w]."

It will then seem probably too refined and narrowing a distinction, when some Divines of that Communion, countenanced by the language of the Council of Trent[x], maintain, in opposition to other error[y], that venial sins only are remitted by the Holy Eucharist, since to ap-

Liturgies, Ass. v. 208, 9. comp. S. Ephr. Paræn. xi. ad Pœnit. Opp. t. iii. p. 429. "Leave me not in hell, most merciful Lord, Who hast given me Thy Body to eat, and made me to drink Thy Blood which is life; through Thy Body may I be cleansed, and through Thy Blood my trespasses be forgiven."

[u] "—by Whose Flesh, sanctified by Thyself, while fed, we are strengthened, and by His Blood, while given us to drink, we are washed." Gallic. Sacram. ap. Muratori Lit. Rom. Vet. p. 816. add Missale Gall-Goth. ap. Mabillon, p. 229.

[v] Post-Comm. for the Circumcision, &c. In the Sarum, York, and Hereford Missals, daily.

[w] 3rd Post-Comm. for Ash-Wedn. &c. Also in the Præp. ad Miss. in the Breviary, "Grant that this holy foretaste of Thy Body and Blood, which I, unworthy, look to receive, may be the perfect cleansing of sins, &c." [A friend adds the following; "Deliver me by this Thy All-holy Body and Blood from all mine iniquities and all evils;" prayer before communicating, (so also Sar. "all my evils," York. Heref.) "Grant that I may so worthily receive this All-holy Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that I may be meet to receive thereby remission of all my sins and be filled with Thy Holy Spirit." Sar. Prayer before kiss of peace. "Grant us so to receive this Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord God Jesus Christ, that we may be meet to receive thereby remission of our sins, &c." York and Heref. ib. "By the operation, O Lord, of this mystery may both our offences (vitia) be purged away and our good desires brought to good effect." Post-Comm. Vigil of Epiph., Lent Ember-Fr., Palm-Sunday. "Cleansed from guilt [expiati] by Thy Holy Mysteries, O Lord, may we obtain, we beseech Thee, both pardon and grace." 1st Post-Comm. 3rd S. in Lent. "May the receiving, O Lord, of this Sacrament cleanse us from our guilt" [crimine]. Fr. after 3rd, and Tu. after 4th S. in Lent, "a vitiis expiatos," 3rd S. in Adv.]

[x] "An antidote, whereby we may be set free from sins of daily incursion, and preserved from mortal sins." Sess. xiii. c. 3.

[y] "That forgiveness of sins was the chief object of the Holy Eucharist." Ib. can. 3.

proach it in mortal sin were itself mortal sin. For although our own Church also requires at least confession to God, and pronounces His absolution over us before we dare approach those holy Mysteries, yet because we are so far freed from our sins, that we may approach, to our salvation not to condemnation, yet can we say that we are so freed, that nothing remains to be washed away? that the absolution, which admits to that cleansing Blood, is every thing, that cleansing Blood Itself, in this respect also, addeth nothing? Rather, the penitent's comfort is, that, as, in S. Basil's[z] words on frequent communion, "continual participation of life is nothing else than manifold life," so, often communion of that Body which was broken and that Blood which was shed for the remission of sins, is manifold remission of those sins over which he mourns, that as the loving-kindness of God admits him again and again to that Body and that Blood, the stains which his soul had contracted are more and more effaced, the guilt more and more purged, the wounds more and more healed, that atoning Blood more and more interposed between him and his sins, himself more united with his Lord, Who Alone is Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption.

Since then, this Divine Sacrament has, as its immediate and proper end, union with Him Who hath taken our manhood into God, and the infusion into us of His Spirit and life and immortality, making us one with His glorified Humanity, as He is One in the Godhead with the Father, and, besides this, it is ulteriorly, the cleansing of our sins, the refining our corruptions, the repairing of our decays, what must the loss of the Church of the latter days, in which Communions are so infrequent! How can we wonder that love should have waxed cold, corruptions so abound, grievous falls have been, among our youth, almost the rule,

[z] Ep. 93. ad Cæsar. t. iii. p. 186. ed. Ben.

to stand upright the exception, Heathen strictness reproach Christian laxity, the Divine life become so rare, all higher instances of it so few and faint, when "the stay and the staff," the strength of that life is willingly forfeited? How should there be the fulness of the Divine life, amid all but a month-long fast from our "daily Bread?" While in the largest portion of the Church, the people mostly gaze at the threshold of the Heaven where they do not enter[a], what do we? We seem, alas! even to have forgotten, in our very thoughts, that daily Communion, which once was the common privilege of the whole Church, which, when the Eastern Church relaxed in her first love, the Western continued, and which they from whom we have our Communion Service in its present form, at first hoped to restore[b]. It implies a life, so different from this our common-place ordinary tenor, a life so above this world as knit with Him Who hath overcome the world; so Angelic as living on Him Who is Angels' Food[c]; an union with God so close; that we cannot mostly, I suppose, imagine to ourselves, how we could daily thus be in Heaven, and in our daily business here below, how sanctify our daily duties, thoughts, refreshment, so that they should be tinged with the hues reflected by our daily Heaven, not that heavenly Gift be dimmed with our earthliness; how our souls should through the day shine with the glory of that ineffable Presence to which we had approached, not we approach to it with earth-dimmed souls. It must ever be so; we cannot know the Gift of God, if we

[a] "*Hearing* Mass" in the Roman Communion. This is, of course, said of the general declension of Communions; at early Masses, even on week-days, the writer is informed that there are Communicants, but not to what extent.

[b] Edw. VI. 1st book. See Pref. to Tract 81. p. 18.

[c] S. Cyr. Al. in S. Joh. l. iv. p. 351. S. Jer. Ep. ad Hedib. q. 2. S. Aug. in Ps. 33. En. i. §. 6. "That Eternal Word, Wherewith the Angels are fed, Which is equal with the Father, men ate, because 'being in the Form of God, &c.' The Angels are satisfied with Him; but He 'emptied Himself' that men might eat Angels' food." (on Ps. 78, 26.)

forfeit it; we must cease mostly even to long for what we forego. We lose the very sense to understand it.

It is not in blame of others, my brethren, God forbid! it is as the confession of a common fault, to which others have contributed least who have been least unworthy, and which, if we confess, God may the rather teach us how to amend, that I dare not but notice, how, even in this privileged and protected place, we still mostly forego even what remains, and what our Liturgy still enjoins. We have learned even, as people needs must, to justify the omission. As those, who know not our privileges of daily service, think set daily prayers must become a lifeless form, so right-minded persons speak, (and perhaps until they know it, must needs speak,) as though not we needed more reverence to partake worthily of the Communion weekly, but as though weekly Communions must needs decrease, not increase, reverence. And thus in this abode, which God has encompassed and blessed with privileges above all others, where so many have been brought into an especial nearness to Him, and a sacredness of office, so many look to be so brought, and yet on that account need the more watchfulness and Divine strength that they fall not,—where, if we will, we may retire into ourselves, as much as we will, and have daily prayers to prepare our souls,—we have, in very many cases, not even the privileges which are becoming common in village-Churches; we all, to whom it is expressly, as by name, enjoined, to "receive[c] the Holy Communion with the Priest every Sunday *at the least*," have it perhaps scarcely monthly[d]; and the thanksgiving for the Ascension of our Lord stands in our Prayer Book year by year unuttered, because when He ascended up on high to receive gifts for men, there are none here below

[c] Rubric after Communion Service.

[d] One College, it should be said, has, for some time past, restored weekly Communion.

to receive the Gift He won for us, or Himself Who is the Giver and the Gift. Nor has this been ever thus; even a century and a half ago, this Cathedral was remarked as one of those, where, after the desolation of the Great Rebellion, weekly Communions were still celebrated [e].

But, however we may see that our present decay and negligence should not continue, restoration must not be rashly compassed. It is not a matter of obeying rubrics, but of life or death, of health or decay, of coming together for the better or for the worse, to salvation or to condemnation. Healthful restoration is a work of humility, not to be essayed as though we had the disposal of things, and could at our will replace, what by our forefathers' negligence was lost, and by our sins bound up with theirs is yet forfeited. Sound restoration must be the gift of God, to be sought of Him in humiliation, in prayer, in mutual forbearance and charity, with increased strictness of life and more diligent use of what we have. We must consult one for the other. There is, in our fallen state, a reverent abstaining from more frequent Communion, founded on real though undue fears; there is and ought to be a real consciousness that more frequent Communion should involve a change of life,

[e] Archdeacon Grenville to Sir Wm. Dugdale, in Life and Correspondence of Sir Wm. Dugdale, p. 429, 30. Letter 174, A.D. 1683. "I am informed that his Grace my Lord of Canterbury hath determined on the setting up a weekly Celebration of the Holy Communion, according to the Rubric, in the Church of Canterbury, and that my Lord Archbishop of York is likewise doing the same in his Cathedral, and that they are both writing letters to the Bishops within their Provinces, to follow their example; a noble work of piety, which will prove to their everlasting honour, and very much facilitate conformity in the land, which hath been very much wounded by the bad example of Cathedrals, which have (for the most part) authorized the breach of law, in omitting the weekly celebration of the Eucharist, which hath not been constantly celebrated on Sundays in any Cathedral but Christ Church, Ely, and Worcester." [Archdeacon Grenville was a son-in-law of Bp. Cosins, and "maintained" for many years the "order which Bishop Cosins had restored," until 1688, when he resigned his preferment, and went into exile, ib. p. 431 and 229, note.]

more collectedness in God, more retirement, at times, from society, deeper consciousness of His Presence, more sacredness in our ordinary actions whom He so vouchsafeth to hallow, greater love for His Passion which we celebrate, and carrying it about, in strictness of self-rule and self-discipline, and self-denying love. And these graces, we know too well, come slowly. Better, then, for a time forego what any would long for, or obtain it, where by God's bounty and Providence that Gift may be had, than by premature urgency, "walk not charitably," or risk injury to a brother's soul. He Who alone can make more frequent Communion a blessing, and Who gave such strength to that one heavenly meal, whereby through forty days and forty nights of pilgrimage He carried Elijah to His Presence at the Mount of God, can, if we be faithful and keep His Gift which we receive, give such abundant strength to our rarer Communions, that they shall carry us through our forty years of trial unto His own Holy Hill, and the Vision of Himself in bliss. Rather should those who long for it, fear that if It were given them, they might not be fitted for it, or, if we have it, that we come short of the fulness of its blessing, than use inconsiderate eagerness in its restoration. Ask we it of God, so will He teach us, how to obtain it of those whom He has made its dispensers to us. They too have their responsibilities, not to bestow it prematurely, though they be involved in the common loss. Let us each suspect ourselves, not others; the backward their own backwardness, the forward their own eagerness; each habitually interpret well the other's actions and motives; they who seek to partake more often of the heavenly Food, honour the reverence and humility which abstains, and they who think it reverent to abstain, censure not as innovation, the return to ancient devotion and love; restore it, if we may, at such an hour of the day, when to be absent need not cause pain or perplexity,

and may make least distinction; so, while we each think all good of the other, may we all together, strengthened by the Same Bread, washed by the Same Blood, be led, in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace and holiness of life, to that ineffable Feast, where not, as now, in Mysteries, but, face to face, we shall ever see God, and be ever filled with His Goodness and His Love.

Meantime such of us, as long to be penitents, may well feel that we are less than the least of God's mercies; that we have already far more than we deserve; (for whereas we deserved Hell, we have the antepast of Heaven;) that the children's bread is indeed taken and given unto dogs; that He, Who is undefiled, spotless, separate from sinners, cometh to be a guest with us sinners; and therein may we indeed find our comfort and our stay. For where He is, how should there not be forgiveness and life and peace and joy? What other hope need we, if we may indeed hope that we thereby dwell in Him and He in us, He in us, if not by the fulness of His graces, yet with such at least as are fitted to our state, cleansing our iniquities and healing our infirmities, Himself the forgiveness we long for; we in Him, in Whom if we be found in that Day, our pardon is for ever sealed, ourselves for ever cleansed, our iniquity forgiven, and our sin covered.

EXTRACTS

From some Writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

Homily on the Sacrament.

" Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent: *But*, as the Scripture saith, *the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.* The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the Head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this Supper, some of them, the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life."

" It is well known that the meat we seek for in this Supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat, and not bodily; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; so that to think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross carnal feeding, basely objecting and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures. Whereas, by the advice of the Council of Nicene, we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and, leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it, where the Sun of righteousness ever shineth.

Take then this lesson, O thou that art desirous of this Table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend Communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou look up with faith upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with the mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man."

Bishop Ridley.

" Both you and I agree herein, that in the Sacrament is the very, true, and natural Body and Blood of Christ; even that Which was born of the Virgin Mary; Which ascended into heaven; Which sits on the right hand of God the Father; Which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. We confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I, being by God's word fully thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural Body to be in the Sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that Bread and Wine, receiveth effectually Christ's Body and drinketh His Blood (that is, he is made effectually partaker of His passion); and you make a grosser kind of being enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the shape or form of Bread and Wine. Now this difference considered, to the question thus I answer, that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the natural Body and Blood of Christ *vere et realiter*, indeed and really, if you take these words 'indeed and really' for spiritually by grace and efficacy; for so every worthy receiver receiveth the very true Body of Christ. But if you mean really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable body under the forms of bread and wine, then, in that sense, is not Christ's Body in the Sacrament really and indeed."

" Always my protestation reserved, I answer, thus; that in the Sacrament is a certain change, in that that Bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's Body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth His Body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's Body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes

see only bread. Such a Sacramental mutation I grant to be in the Bread and Wine, which truly is no small change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ's word." *Works,* edit. 1843. p. 274.

" Think not because I disallow that Presence which the first proposition maintaineth (as a presence which I take to be forged, phantastical, and beside the authority of God's word, perniciously brought into the Church by the Romanists,) that I therefore go about to take away the true Presence of Christ's Body in His Supper rightly and duly ministered, which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful Fathers. They that think so of me, the Lord knoweth how far they are deceived. And to make the same evident unto you, I will in few words declare what True Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper I hold and affirm, with the word of God, and the ancient Fathers.

" I say and confess with the Evangelist Luke, and with the Apostle Paul, that the Bread on the which thanks are given is the Body of Christ in the remembrance of Him and His death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until His coming.

" I say and confess the Bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ's Body with the ancient and the faithful Fathers.

" I say and believe, that there is not only a signification of Christ's Body set forth by the Sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ's Body, that is, the food of life and immortality, and this I hold with Cyprian.

" I say also with St. Augustine, that we eat life and we drink life; with Emissene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; with Athanasius, that we receive celestial food which cometh from above; the property of natural communion, with Hilary[a]; the nature of flesh and benediction which giveth life, in Bread and Wine, with Cyril; and with the same Cyril[b], the virtue of the very Flesh of Christ, life and grace of His Body,

[a] The passage quoted at more length in the Sermon, p. 13.

[b] See Sermon, p. 7. n. i. &c.

the property of the Only-Begotten, that is to say, life, as He Himself in plain words expoundeth it.

"I confess also with Basil, that we receive the mystical advent and coming of Christ, grace, and the virtue of His very nature; the Sacrament of His very Flesh, with Ambrose; the Body by grace, with Epiphanius; spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified, with Jerome; grace flowing into a sacrifice, and the grace of the Spirit, with Chrysostom; grace and invisible verity, grace and society of the members of Christ's Body, with Augustine.

"Finally with Bertram, (who was the last of all these,) I confess that Christ's Body is in the Sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the Word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it. Out of these I suppose it may clearly appear unto all men, how far we are from that opinion, whereof some go about falsely to slander us to the world, saying, we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's table, but a figure of the Body of Christ." P. 201, 202.

Bishop Bilson, (quoted by Bishop Mountagu.)

"The disagreement is only in de modo præsentiæ, the thing is yielded to on either side, and there is in the Holy Eucharist a real Presence. 'God forbid,' saith Bishop Bilson, 'we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves withal." (p. 779 *of the subject.*) *Appeal*, c. 30 *init.* p. 289. *See also Bp. White, below*, p. 57.

Hooker.

"Being assembled for no other cause which they could imagine but to have eaten the Passover only that Moses appointeth, when they saw their Lord and Master with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven first bless and consecrate for the endless good of all generations till the world's end the chosen elements of Bread and Wine, which elements made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of His Divine benediction, they being the first that were commanded to receive from Him, the first which were

warranted by His promise that not only unto them at the present time but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those Mysteries should serve as conducts of life and conveyances of His Body and Blood unto them, was it possible they should hear that voice, "Take, eat, this is My Body; drink ye all of this, this is My Blood;" possible that doing what was required and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves? They had at that time a sea of comfort and joy to wade in, and we by that which they did are taught that this heavenly food is given for the satisfying of our empty souls, and not for the exercising of our curious and subtile wits."

"If we doubt what those admirable words may import, let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ to whom Christ was Himself a schoolmaster, let our Lord's Apostle be His interpreter, content we ourselves with His explication, My Body, *the Communion of My Body*, My Blood, *the Communion of My Blood.* Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our Life because through Him we obtain life, so the parts of this Sacrament are His Body and Blood, for that they are so to us who receiving them receive that by them which they are termed? The Bread and Cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are effects, the cause whereof is the Person of Christ, His Body and Blood are the true well-spring out of which this life floweth. So that His Body and Blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in every thing which they quicken, but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with Him even as He and the Father are one." Book v. chap. lxvii. §. 4, 5.

"It is on all sides plainly confessed, first, that this Sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth

Himself, even His whole entire Person, *as a mystical Head* unto every soul that receiveth Him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as *a mystical member of* Him, yea of them also whom He acknowledgeth to be His own; secondly, that to whom *the Person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same Sacrament His Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth Him which is their Head; thirdly, that what *merit, force, or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed Body and Blood,* we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this Sacrament; fourthly, that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the Sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature, must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of His glorious power*, Who is able and will bring to pass, that the Bread and Cup which He giveth us shall be truly the thing He promiseth.

" It seemeth therefore much amiss, that against them whom they term Sacramentaries, so many invective discourses are made all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and that the efficacy of His Body and Blood is not all we receive in this Sacrament. For no man having read their books and writings which are thus traduced can be ignorant that both these assertions they plainly confess to be most true. They do not so interpret the words of Christ as if the name of His Body did import but the figure of His Body, and to be were only to signify His Blood. They grant that these holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that Body and Blood which were given for the life of the world, and besides also impart unto us even in true and real though mystical manner the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire, as hath been shewed." Book v. chap. lxvii. §. 7, 8.

" He which hath said of the one Sacrament, ' Wash, and be clean,' hath said concerning the other likewise, ' Eat, and live.' If therefore, without any such particular and solemn warrant as this is, that poor distressed woman coming unto Christ for health

could so constantly resolve herself, 'may I but touch the skirt of His garment I shall be whole,' what moveth us to argue of the manner how life should come by bread, our duty being here but to take what is offered, and most assuredly to rest persuaded of this, that can we but eat we are safe? When I behold with mine eyes some small and scarce discernible grain or seed whereof nature maketh promise that a tree shall come, and when afterwards of that tree any skilful artificer undertaketh to frame some exquisite and curious work, I look for the event, I move no question about performance, either of the one or of the other. Shall I simply credit nature in things natural, shall I in things artificial rely myself on art, never offering to make doubt, and in that which is above both art and nature refuse to believe the Author of both, except He acquaint me with His ways, and lay the secret of His skill before me? Where God Himself doth speak those things which either for height and sublimity of matter, or else for secresy of performance we are not able to reach unto, as we may be ignorant without danger, so it can be no disgrace to confess we are ignorant. Such as love piety will as much as in them lieth know all things that God commandeth, but especially the duties of service which they owe to God. As for His dark and hidden works, they prefer as becometh them in such cases simplicity of faith before that knowledge, which curiously sifting what it should adore, and disputing too boldly of that which the wit of man cannot search, chilleth for the most part all warmth of zeal, and bringeth soundness of belief many times into great hazard. Let it therefore be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's Table, to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise; let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, and hitherto in this cause but over patiently heard, let them take their rest; let curious and sharp-witted men beat their heads about what questions themselves will, the very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of His gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and

unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this new Wine, this Bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this Cup hallowed with solemn benediction availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving, with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ; what these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God, Thou art true, O my soul, thou art happy!" Book v. chap. lxvii. §. 12.

"The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the earth, and bringeth God Himself down from heaven; by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible grace; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that Flesh which was given for the life of the world, and that Blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive. O wretched blindness, if we admire not so great power; more wretched if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding, imagine that any but God can bestow it! To whom Christ hath imparted power, both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one, (a work which antiquity doth call the making of Christ's Body,) the same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible." Book v. chap. lxxvii. §. 1.

Bishop Overall.

"*So to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood.*] By this it may be known what our Church believeth, and teacheth of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament. And though our new masters would make the world believe she had another mind, yet we are not

to follow their private fancies, when we have so plain and so public a doctrine as this."

"*That we receiving these Thy creatures of Bread and Wine, &c. may be partakers of His blessed Body and Blood*] Together with the hallowed elements of the Bread and Wine, we may receive the Body and Blood of Christ, which are truly exhibited in this Sacrament, the one as well as the other.

"These words, as I once conferred with a Papist, were mightily excepted against, because forsooth they must acknowledge no Bread and Wine, but a desition of the nature and being of both. My answer was, that here we term them so before consecration; after that we call them so no more, but abstain from that name, because our thoughts might be wholly taken up with the spiritual food of Christ's Body and Blood. So in the Thanksgiving following we say, *That hast vouchsafed to feed us with these holy Mysteries, and the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Thy Son, &c.* In the meanwhile we deny not the Bread and Wine to remain there still as God's creatures. And I wonder the Papists should so contend for this same *desitio panis et vini*, whenas in their own service or mass, they abstain not from these words, THY CREATURES, after consecration, as we do. See the book, PER QUEM OMNIA DOMINE BONE CREAS! A certain argument that the Church of Rome never meant to teach that doctrine, which private men, the late doctors and schoolmen, have brought up and propagated."

"*These holy Mysteries were the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood,* &c.] Before consecration, we called them God's creatures of Bread and Wine, now we do so no more after consecration; wherein we have the advantage of the Church of Rome, who call them still creatures in their very mass after consecration; and yet they will be upbraiding us for denying the Real Presence, whenas we believe better than they: for after consecration we think no more of Bread and Wine, but have our thoughts taken up wholly with the Body of Christ; and therefore we keep ourselves to these words only, abstaining from the other (though the Bread remain there still, to the eye,) which they do not. And herein we follow the Fathers, who after consecration would not suffer it to be called Bread and Wine any longer, but the Body and Blood of Christ.

"*Very Members Incorporate.*] So Cyril. in Catech. Myst. 4. *Sumpto Corpore et Sanguine Christi fit nos fieri* συσσώμους, *i. e.*

ejusdem Corporis cum Christo, et inter nos συναίμους, *i. e. ejusdem Sanguinis.*

"*And be also heirs through hope.*] So the ancient Fathers were wont to prove the article of our resurrection by the nature of this very Sacrament. They use this reason to exhort the people unto the frequent receiving of the Holy Communion; because they say it is, φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, *Medicamentum Immortalitatis et Antidotum,* τὸ μὴ θανεῖν, *An antidote not to die;* which if the men of this age would but set their hearts on, as they did, we should not have them set so slightly by the Sacrament as they do."

"*Bread and Wine.*] It is confessed by all Divines, that upon the words of the Consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it, and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner. But there yet remains this controversy among some of them, whether the Body of Christ be present only in the use of the Sacrament, and in the act of eating, and not otherwise. They that hold the affirmative, as the Lutherans (in Confess. Sax.) and all Calvinists, do seem to me to depart from all Antiquity, which place the presence of Christ in the virtue and benediction used by the Priest, and not in the use of eating the Sacrament.—And this did most Protestants grant and profess at first, though now the Calvinists make Popish magic of it in their licentious blasphemy." *Additional Notes to the Book of Common Prayer.*

"*What is the inward part or thing signified?*] I cannot see where any real difference is betwixt us about this Real Presence, if we could give over the study of contradiction, and understand one another aright." *Catechism.*

"In the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore the whole of Christ is verily and indeed present, and is verily partaken by us, and verily combined with the Sacramental signs, as being not only significative, but exhibitory; so that in the Bread duly given and received, the Body of Christ is given and received; in the Wine given and received, the Blood of Christ is given and received; and thus there is a communion of the whole of Christ, in the communion of the Sacrament."

Probably, had Overall lived before the tenth century, he

would have thought he had sufficiently stated his belief, in the above expressions; but placed as he was in other circumstances, it was expedient for him, not only to maintain ancient truth, but to protest against erroneous innovation: he therefore added these words:—

"Yet not in any bodily, gross, earthly manner, as by transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or any like devices of human reason, but in a mystical, heavenly, and spiritual manner, as is rightly laid down in our Articles." (*As quoted and translated in Knox's Remains*, vol. ii. p. 163.)

Bishop Morton.

"The question is not absolutely concerning a Real Presence, which Protestants (as their own Jesuits witness) do also profess. . . . . Which acknowledgment of our adversaries may serve to stay the contrary clamours and calumnious accusations, wherein they use to range Protestants with those heretics who denied that the true Body of Christ was in the Eucharist, and maintained only a figure and image of Christ's Body, seeing that our difference is not about the truth or reality of presence, but about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof."—*Catholic Appeal*, p. 93. ed. 1610.

Bishop Andrewes.

"The Cardinal is not, unless 'willingly, ignorant,' that Christ hath said, 'This is My Body,' not 'This is not My Body *in this mode*.' Now about the object we are both agreed; all the controversy is about the *mode*. The 'This is,' we firmly believe; that 'it is in this mode' (the Bread, namely, being transubstantiated into the Body), or of the mode whereby it is wrought that 'it is,' whether *in*, or *with*, or *under*, or *transubstantiated*, there is not a word in the Gospel. And because not a word is there, we rightly detach it from being a matter of faith; we may place it amongst the decrees of the schools, not among the articles of faith. What Durandus is reported to have said of old, (Neand. Synop. Chron. p. 203.) we approve of. 'We hear the word, feel the effect, know not the manner, believe the Presence.' The Presence, I say, we believe, and that no less true than yourselves. Of the mode of the Presence, we define nothing rashly, nor, I add, do we curiously enquire; no more than how

the Blood of Christ cleanseth us in our Baptism; no more than how in the Incarnation of Christ the human nature is united into the same Person with the Divine. We rank it among Mysteries, (and indeed the Eucharist itself is a mystery,) 'that which remaineth, ought to be burnt with fire.' (Ex. xii. 13.) that is, as the Fathers elegantly express it, to be adored by faith, not examined by reason." *Answer to Bellarmine,* c. i. p. 11.

"To conclude; not only thus to frame meditations and resolutions, but even some practice too, out of this act of 'apprehension.' It is very agreeable to reason, saith the Apostle, that we endeavour and make a proffer, if we may by any means, to 'apprehend' Him in His, by Whom we are thus in our nature 'apprehended,' or, as He termeth it, 'comprehended,' even Christ Jesus; and be united to Him this day, as He was to us this day, by a mutual and reciprocal 'apprehension.' We may so, and we are bound so; *vere dignum et justum est.* And we do so, so oft as we do with St. James lay hold of, 'apprehend,' or receive *insitum Verbum,* the 'Word which is daily grafted into us.' For 'the Word' He is, and in the word He is received by us. But that is not the proper of this day, unless there be another joined unto it. This day *Verbum caro factum est,* and so must be 'apprehended' in both. But specially in His flesh as this day giveth it, as this day would have us. Now 'the Bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body, of the Flesh, of Jesus Christ?" It is surely; and by it and by nothing more are we made partakers of this blessed union. A little before He said, 'Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also would take part with them.' May not we say the same? Because He hath so done, taken ours of us, we also ensuing His steps will participate with Him and with His Flesh which He hath taken of us. It is most kindly to take part with Him in that which He took part in with us, and that, to no other end, but that He might make the receiving of it by us a means whereby He might 'dwell in us, and we in Him;' He taking our flesh, and we receiving His Spirit; by His flesh which He took of us receiving His Spirit which He imparteth to us; that, as He by ours became *consors humanæ naturæ,* so we by His might become *consortes Divinæ naturæ,* 'partakers of the Divine nature.' Verily, it is the most straight and perfect 'taking hold' that is. No union so

knitteth as it. Not consanguinity; brethren fall out. Not marriage; man and wife are severed. But that which is nourished, and the nourishment wherewith—they never are, never can be severed, but remain one for ever. With this act then of mutual 'taking,' taking of His flesh as He hath taken ours, let us seal our duty to Him this day, for taking not 'Angels,' but 'the seed of Abraham.'" *Serm. I. on Nativity, Works,* vol. i. p. 16.

"He is given us, as Himself saith, as 'the living Bread from Heaven,' which Bread is His 'flesh' born this day, and after 'given for the life of the world.' For look how we do give back that He gave us, even so doth He give back to us that which we gave Him, that which He had of us. This He gave for us in Sacrifice, and this He giveth us in the Sacrament, that the Sacrifice may by the Sacrament be truly applied to us. And let me commend this to you; He never bade, *accipite*, plainly 'take,' but in this only; and that, because the effect of this day's union is no ways more lively represented, no way more effectually wrought, than by this use." *Serm. II. on Nativity,* vol. i. p. 30.

"And I may safely say it with good warrant, from those words especially and chiefly, which, as He Himself saith of them, are "spirit and life," even those words, which joined to the element make the blessed Sacrament.

"There was good proof made of it this day. All the way did He preach to them, even till they came to Emmaus, and their hearts were hot within them, which was a good sign: but their eyes were not opened but "at the breaking of bread," and then they were. That is the best and surest sense we know, and therefore most to be accounted of. There we taste, and there we see; "taste and see how gracious the Lord is." There we are made to "drink of the Spirit," there our "hearts are strengthened and stablished with grace." There is the Blood which shall "purge our consciences from dead works," whereby we may "die to sin." There the Bread of God, which shall endue our souls with much strength; yea, multiply strength in them to live unto God; yea, to live to Him continually; for he that "eateth His flesh and drinketh His blood, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him;" not inneth, or sojourneth for a time, but dwelleth continually. And, never can we more

truly, or properly say *in Christo Jesu Domino nostro,* as when we come new from that holy action, for then He is in us, and we in Him indeed." *Serm. I. on the Resurrection,* p. 204, 5.

" If such a new consecrating we need, what better time than the feast of first-fruits, the sacrificing time under the Law? and in the Gospel, the day of Christ's rising, our first-fruits, by Whom we are thus consecrate? The day wherein He was Himself restored to the perfection of His spiritual life, the life of glory, is the best for us to be restored in to the first fruits of that spiritual life, the life of grace.

" And if we ask, what shall be our means of this consecrating? The Apostle telleth us, we are sanctified by the " oblation of the Body of Jesus." That is the best means to restore us to that life. He hath said it, and shewed it Himself; " He that eateth Me, shall live by Me." The words spoken concerning that, are both " spirit and life," whether we seek for the spirit or seek for life. Such was the means of our death, by eating the forbidden fruit, the first-fruits of death; and such is the means of our life, by eating the flesh of Christ, the first-fruits of life.

" And herein we shall very fully fit, not the time only and the means, but also the manner. For as by partaking the flesh and blood, the substance of the " first Adam," we came to our death, so to life we cannot come, unless we do participate with the flesh and blood of the " second Adam," that is, Christ. We drew death from the first, by partaking the substance; and so must we draw life from the second, by the same. This is the way; become branches of the Vine, and partakers of His nature, and so of His life and verdure both." *Serm. II.* p. 219, 20.

" To end; because we be speaking of a hope to be laid up in our bosom, it falleth out very fitly, that even at this time, *festum spei,* the Church offereth us a notable pledge, and earnest of this hope there to bestow; even the holy Eucharist, the flesh wherein our Redeemer was seen and suffered, and paid the price of our redemption; and together with it " the holy Spirit, whereby we are sealed to the great day of our redemption." To the laying up of which earnest of our hope, and interest in all these, we are invited at this time, even literally to lodge and lay it up in our bosom. We shall be the nearer our *scio,* if " we taste and see by it, how gracious the Lord is;" the nearer our *spero,* if an earnest or pledge of it be laid up within us; the nearer our redemption, if we have within us the price of it; and

the nearer our resurrection—they be His own words, "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh, &c. hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." So dwell we in Him, and He in us; we in Him by our flesh in Him, and He in us by His flesh in us. Thereby drawing life from Him the second, as we do death from the first Adam." *Serm. V.* p. 268.

"The Church by her office, or *agendum,* doth her part to help us herein, all she may. The things we are willed to seek she sets before us, the blessed Mysteries. For these are from above; the "Bread that came down from Heaven," the Blood that hath been carried "into the holy place." And I add, *ubi Christus;* for *ubi Corpus, ubi Sanguis Christi, ibi Christus,* I am sure. And truly here, if there be an *ubi Christus,* there it is. On earth we are never so near Him, nor He us, as then and there. There *in efficaciâ,* and when all is done, efficacy, that is it must do us good, must raise us here, and raise us at the last day to the right hand; and the local *ubi* without it of no value." *Serm. VIII.* vol. ii. p. 321.

"But to be temples is not all, we are farther to be *Templum hoc,* "this Temple;" and this was "the Temple of His Body." And that are we, if at any time, then certainly when as if we were temples in very deed, we prepare to receive, not the Ark of His presence, but Himself, that He may come into us and be in us; which is at what time we present ourselves to receive His blessed Body and Blood; that Body and that Blood which for our sakes was dissolved, dissolved three days since, when it suffered for our sins. And this day raised again, when it rose for our justification.

"Which when we do, that is, receive this Body or this Temple, for *Templum hoc* and *Hoc est Corpus Meum* are now come to be one, for both *Templum hoc* and *Corpus hoc* are in *Templum corporis Sui;* and when the temples of our body are in this Temple, and the Temple of His Body in the temples of ours, then are there three Temples in one, a Trinity, the perfectest number of all. Then if ever are we, not temples only, but *Templa corporis Sui,* 'Temples of His Body,' and this Scripture fulfilled in us." *Serm. X.* vol. ii. p. 362.

"In Christ this sign is a sign, not betokening only, but exhibiting also what it betokeneth, as the Sacraments do. For of signs, some shew only and work nothing; such was that of Jonas in itself, *sed ecce plus quam Jonas hic.* For some other

there be that shew and work both—work what they shew, present us with what they represent, what they set before us, set or graft in us. Such is that of Christ. For besides that it sets before us of His, it is farther a seal or pledge to us of our own, that what we see in Him this day, shall be accomplished in our own selves, at His good time.

"And even so pass we to another mystery, for one mystery leads us to another; this in the text, to the holy mysteries we are providing to partake, which do work like, and do work to this, even to the raising of the soul with "the first resurrection." And as they are a means for the raising of our soul out of the soil of sin—for they are given us, and we take them expressly for the remission of sins—so are they no less a means also, for the raising our bodies out of the dust of death. The sign of that Body which was thus "in the heart of the earth," to bring us from thence at the last. Our Saviour saith it *totidem verbis*, "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My Blood, I will raise him up at the last day." *Serm. XII.* p. 402, 3.

"The third place is St. Augustine, that Christ in these words had a farther meaning; to wean her from all sensual and fleshly touching, and teach her a new and a true touch, truer than that she was about. This sense groweth out of Christ's reason: 'Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended,' as if till He were ascended, He would not be touched, and then He would. As much as to say, 'Care not to touch Me here, stand not upon it, touch Me not till I be ascended; stay till then, and then do. That is the true touch, that is it will do you all the good.'

"And there is reason for this sense. For the touch of His Body which she so much desired, that could last but forty days in all, while He in His Body were among them. And what should all since, and we now, have been the better? He was to take her out a lesson, and to teach her another touch, that might serve for all to the world's end; that might serve when the Body and bodily touch were taken from us.

"Christ Himself touched upon this point in the sixth chapter, at the sixty-second verse, when at Capernaum they stumbled at the speech of eating His flesh. "What," saith He, "find you this strange, now? How will you find it then, when you shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" How then? And yet then you must eat, or else there is no life in you.

"So it is a plain item to her, that there may be a sensual touching of Him here; but that is not it, not the right, it avails little. It was her error this, she was all for the corporal presence, for the touch with the fingers. So were His disciples, all of them, too much addicted to it. From which they were now to be weaned, that if they had before known Christ, or touched Him after the flesh, yet now from henceforth they were to do so no more, but learn a new touch; to touch Him, being now ascended. Such a touching there is, or else His reason holds not; and best touching Him so, better far than this of hers she was so eager on." *Serm. XV. on Resur.* vol. iii. p. 36.

"As these are their (the Romanists) imaginations, so we want not ours. For many among us fancy only a Sacrament in this action, and look strange at the mention of a Sacrifice; whereas we not only use it as a nourishment spiritual, as that it is too, but as a mean also to renew a 'covenant' with God by virtue of that 'Sacrifice,' as the Psalmist speaketh. So our Saviour Christ in the institution telleth us, in the twenty-second chapter of Luke and twentieth verse, and the Apostle, in the thirteenth chapter of Hebrews and tenth verse. And the old writers use no less the word Sacrifice than Sacrament, altar than table, offer than eat; but both indifferently, to shew there is both.

"And again too, that to a many with us it is indeed so *fractio panis*, as it is that only and nothing beside; whereas the 'Bread which we break is the partaking of Christ's true 'Body'—and not of a sign, figure, or remembrance of it. For the Church hath ever believed a true fruition of the true Body of Christ in that Sacrament." vol. v. p. 66, 67.

Dr. Donne.

"But yet, though this Bread be not so transubstantiated, we refuse not the words of the Fathers, in which they have expressed themselves in this mystery. Not *Irenæus* his '*est corpus*,' that that Bread is His Body now. Not Tertullian's '*fecit corpus*,' that that Bread is made His Body which was not so before. Not St. Cyprian's '*mutatus*,' that that Bread is changed. Not Damascene's '*supernaturaliter mutatus*,' that that Bread is not only changed so in the use, as when at the King's table certain portions of bread are made bread of essay, to pass over every dish

whether for safety or for majesty; not only so civilly changed, but changed supernaturally. No nor Theophylact's '*transformatus est*,' (which seems to be the word that goes farthest of all,) for this transforming cannot be intended of the outward form and fashion, for that is not changed, but be it of that internal form which is the very essence and nature of the Bread, so it is transformed, so the Bread hath received a new form, a new essence, a new nature, because whereas the nature of bread is but to nourish the body, the nature of this Bread now is to nourish the soul. And therefore *cum non dubitavit Dominus dicere, 'Hoc est Corpus Meum' cum signum daret corporis,* since Christ forbore not to say, "This is My Body," when He gave the sign of His Body, why should we forbear to say of that Bread, This is Christ's Body, which is the sacrament of His Body?" 80 *Sermons.* ed. 1640, p. 37. 4*th Serm. on the Nativity.*

Jackson.

"This is a point, which every Christian is bound expressly to believe, that God the Father, doth neither forgive sins, nor vouchsafe any term or plea of reconciliation, but only for the merits and satisfaction made by the sacrifice of the Son of God, who by the eternal Spirit offered Himself in our human nature upon the Cross. In the next place, we are to believe and acknowledge, that as God the Father doth neither forgive, nor vouchsafe reconciliation, but for the merits and satisfaction of His only Son; so neither will He vouchsafe to convey this or any other blessing unto us, which His Son hath purchased for us, but only through His Son; not only through Him as our Advocate or Intercessor, but through Him as our Mediator, that is, through His Humanity, as the Organ or Conduit, or as the only bond, by which we are united and reconciled unto the Divine Nature. For although the Holy Spirit or third Person in Trinity doth immediately and by Personal propriety work faith and other spiritual graces in our souls, yet doth He not by these spiritual graces unite our souls or spirits immediately unto Himself, but unto Christ's human nature. He doth as it were till the ground of our hearts, and make it fit to receive the seed of life; but this seed of righteousness immediately flows from the Sun of Righteousness, whose sweet influence likewise it is, which doth immediately season, cherish, and ripen

it. The Spirit of Life, whereby our adoption and election is sealed unto us, is the real participation of Christ's Body, which was broken, and of Christ's Blood, which was shed for us. This is the true and punctual meaning of our Apostle's speech, 1 Cor. xv. 45. "*The first man Adam was made a living soul,*" or, as the Syriac hath it, *animale corpus*, an enlivened body; "*but the second Adam was made a quickening Spirit;*" and immediately becometh such to all those which as truly bear His image by the Spirit of Regeneration, which issues from Him, as they have borne the image of the first Adam by natural propagation; and this again is the true and punctual meaning of our Saviour's words, John vi. 63. "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.*" For so He had said in the verses before, to such as were offended at His words, "*What if you should see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?*" The implication contained in the connexion between these two verses and the precedent is this; That Christ's virtual presence, or the influence of life, which His human nature was to distil from His heavenly throne, should be more profitable to such as were capable of it, than His bodily presence; than the bodily eating of His Flesh and Blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that, which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real Presence, or of eating His very Flesh, and drinking His very Blood in the Sacrament. And the Sacramental Bread is called His Body, and the Sacramental Wine His Blood; as for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody Sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from Heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist." vol. iii. p. 327, 8.

"All that are partakers of this Sacrament, eat Christ's Body and drink His Blood sacramentally: that is, they eat that Bread which sacramentally is His Body, and drink that Cup which sacramentally is His Blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully or unfaithfully. For, *all the Israelites* (1 Cor. x.) *drank of the same spiritual rock, which was Christ* sacramentally: *all* of them were partakers of His presence, when Moses smote the rock. Yet, with "*many of them, God was not well pleased,*"

because they did not faithfully either drink or participate of His presence. And more displeased He is with such as eat Christ's Body and drink His Blood unworthily, though they eat and drink them sacramentally: for eating and drinking so onely, that is, without faith, or due respect, they eat and drink to their own condemnation, because they do not discern, or rightly esteem, Christ's Body or Presence in the Holy Sacrament.

"May we say then, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers? Yes, this we must grant, yet must we add withal, that he is really present with them in a quite contrary manner; really present he is, because virtually present to both; because the operation or efficacy of His Body and Blood is not metaphorical but real in both. Thus the bodily sun, though locally distant for its substance, is really present by its heat and light, as well to sore eyes, as to clear sights, but really present to both, by a contrary real operation; and by the like contrary operation, it is really present to clay and to wax, it really hardeneth the one, and really softeneth the other. So doth Christ's Body and Blood, by its invisible, but real influence, mollify the hearts of such as come to the Sacrament with due preparation; but harden such as unworthily receive the consecrated Elements. If he that will hear the word, must take heed how he hears, much more must he which means to receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, be careful how he receives. He that will present himself at this great marriage-feast of the Lamb without a wedding garment, had better be absent. It was always safer, not to approach the presence of God manifested or exhibited in extraordinary manner (as in His sanctuary or in the ark), than to make appearance before it in an unhallowed manner, or without due preparation. Now when we say, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner, as He was present (before His incarnation) in His Sanctuary the Ark of His Covenant; and by the power of His Godhead thus extraordinarily present, He diffuseth the virtue or operation of His human nature, either to the vivification or hardening of their hearts, who receive the Sacramental pledges." vol iii. p. 333, 4.

Sutton.

"There is a far better and safer course than to contend any longer, if men would at last set themselves on all parts to follow it; which is to reverence the Son of God in the unsearchable mysteries of His wisdom which are past finding out; and not to stand weighing them in the light scales and balance of their own reason; to draw a veil over them, or say with the woman of Samaria, *Puteus est altus*, this well is deep, and so with pious hearts to reverence them, and no more ado.

"5. When we have done striving, and even wearied ourselves in a thousand difficulties, brought our minds into a labyrinth of doubts, unless we will make controversies immortal, we must draw at last to an issue.

"The faithful receive the blessed Sacrament. Well, what do they receive? Certainly Christ Jesus, truly and really; to make further scrupie is needless curiosity; to give light credence hereunto, is in part incredulity. What the elements of Bread and Wine are in themselves, is one thing; that they are, being now consecrated to so holy a use, and received of the spiritually minded as the spiritual food of their souls, is another. What they are I say, Christ's own words are sufficient warrant for a believing world unto the world's end. Wherefore, to be over-witted in seeking, or doubting how this should be, is no way agreeable to that faith and obedience that becometh Christians. *Rerum absentium* (saith an ancient father) *præsens est fides; rerum impossibilium, possibilis est fides;* of things absent, faith is present; of things impossible, faith is possible. *Panem vides, verbum audis; Cui potius credis? Sensui, vel Christo?* Thou seest the Bread, thou hearest the word; to which rather dost thou give credit, whether to thy sense, or to Christ? *Cur non potius gaudes? Quid quæris?* Why dost thou not rather rejoice? Why dost thou question?

"6. In this case, that of the blessed Virgin, spoken of Christ at the Marriage at Cana in Galilee, would be remembered; *Quodcunque dixerit vobis, facite;* whatsoever He shall say unto you, do it.

"When the Serpent said unto Eve, *Cur præcepit vobis Deus, ut non comederetis?* Why hath God commanded you not to eat? Had she answered, *Scio quod præcepit, non spectat ad me investigare, causam quare præcepit;* I know He hath com-

manded me so; to seek a reason why, or the cause wherefore, I need not, I ought not;—had she not done far better?" *Godly Meditations on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Preface.*

"10. And now that we may ingeniously confess that which is a plain case in the sight of God, and not flourish over the truth with colours of rhetoric, or smother it with the clouds of deceit, we acknowledge that the dignity of this Sacrament is greater than words can express, yea, than the mind of man is able to conceive. If any will exact the efficacy of those five words, "For this is My Body," we answer, It is a great mystery.

"11. Truly we give, and that justly, great respect and reverence to the holy Eucharist; for whereas bread and wine are elements naturally ordained for the sustenance of the body, by the power of Divine benediction they do receive a virtue, that, being received of the faithful, they become nourishment of the soul, nay, they become means whereby we are sanctified both in body and soul, and are made the members of Christ.

"12. But Christ, some say, in express words calleth the Bread His Body, and the Wine His Blood: true, in express words also He calleth Himself a rock. Right well saith Eusebius Emisenus, "Comest thou to the Sacrament, consider there the Body and Blood of Christ: wonder at it with reverence, touch it with thy mind, receive it with the hand of thy heart; do not say as the Capernaites, "Master, how camest thou hither?" but, with the disciples, asking no question, be glad thou dost enjoy Him. He is honoured in this mystery, that was once offered upon the Cross. Yea, but how can this be, that Christ, sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, should dispose of His Body to us poor inhabitants of earth? Take here the answer of the angel Gabriel, the Holy Ghost hath overshadowed it. "From hence," saith St. Bernard, "to search is temerity, to know is life eternal."

"13. Is it not a hard saying, "Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of God," &c.? It is a hard saying to them that are hard of believing. The disciples hearing that of their Lord and Master, "Take, eat, this is My Body," they take, they eat, asking no question. "Being confirmed in faith," saith St. Chrysostom, "they take and eat; unbelievers hearing the same of

our Saviour, they depart, they eat not." Peter answereth, "Lord, Thou hast the words of life;" others go backward, leaving the Lord of life. The Capernaite, hearing, dreameth of eating naturally, grossly; the godly are assured of eating spiritually, and yet withal really.

"14. Great was the authority of Pythagoras amongst his scholars; if he said it, they were silent; but greater was, and is, and ought to be, the authority of Christ with believers; He saith it, and they believe. The sun remains a splendent body, though bats and owls cannot endure it: the holy Sacrament remains an unspeakable mystery, though the carnal man doth not perceive it. In this case, silence is the safest eloquence, and the best expressing is not to express. A godly meditation is safer than a Socratical disputing Discourse of controversy doth often abate devotion: discourse of piety about this mystery is sweeter than the honey or the honey-comb.

"15. The Passover, which Christ kept with His disciples, was prepared in an upper room. When men brought unto Him a man sick of the palsy, they, in letting down the sick, uncovered the roof of the house. The harder parts of the Paschal Lamb were consumed by fire. Mysteries are, if not contrary, yet often above reason. Well saith St. Cyril, in his third book against Julian, "If human reason waver in things sensible, how much more shall it do so in things beyond sense? Faithless Julian! what if the creation of the angels excel human capacity, did not Moses well in forbearing to mention it? Assuredly he did well. What if it cannot by reason be conceived how Christ, sitting at the table, should give Himself to His, for sustenance, wilt thou, therefore, by and by, imagine this or that change?

"Let us rather honour Christ in His mysteries, praise Him for His mercies, be thankful unto Him for His benefits. Those things which we comprehend let us admire; those which we cannot comprehend, let us more admire: though words be wanting what to express, let not faith be wanting what to believe." *Ib.* p. 287—291.

"31. Well saith Fulgentius, against the Arians, 'True faith hath never superfluous, but it ever had and hath, just reasons.' So also St. Cyril's mysteries are offered to believers, not to questioners.

"32. Albeit, then, the manner be not of us over curiously

inquired or searched after, yet the same presence of Christ is acknowledged which Christ Himself would have to be acknowledged. We say with St. Ambrose, that there is not taken from bread the substance thereof, but that there is adjoined the grace of Christ's Body after a manner ineffable.

"*33.* It was no other but a shadow of this benefit that was of old given to the Jews in the ark of the covenant, and yet Solomon did so admire it, as that he said, 'And is it credible that God should dwell with men?'

"*34.* We often marvel and condemn the Jews, that, having Christ amongst them, they did not acknowledge and receive Him in that manner they ought to have done. Let us consider Christ among us, and invert that saying of the husbandmen, 'This is the heir,' let us take him, receive him, believe in him, 'and the inheritance shall be ours.'

"*35.* Last of all, concerning the controversy about the holy Eucharist, between two extremes, whereof we have heard, let us embrace the means, let us, with a sincere faith, apprehend the truth, apprehending, let us keep it, keeping, let us adore it with godly manners.

"*36.* And now to draw in, as it were, the sails of this admonition, godly reader, seeing that this divine institution was left by our gracious Redeemer, both for the inward peace of the soul, and outward of the Church, who can sufficiently lament to see the dissention that hath miserably divided the Christian world, and discord that hath risen about the same! Let us call to mind, that God is not the God of dissention, but the God of peace. Let us all forbear on both sides needless and unprofitable disputes. Unless Thou, Lord, hadst said it, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," who would have believed it? Unless Thou hadst said, O holy Christ, "Take, eat, drink ye all of this," who durst have touched it? Who would have approached to so heavenly a repast, hadst Thou not commanded it, *hoc facite*, do ye this; but Thou commanding, who would not joyfully come and communicate?

"*37.* Let us then hold captive human reason, and prepare ourselves unto the fruit of this heavenly manna. Unnecessary disputes bring small profits, we may with greater benefit wonder than argue. Then are the works of God most truly conceived, when they are devoutly admired." *Ib.* p. 299—301.

"Consider the divine Wisdom of the Son of God, who, re-

specting our weakness, hath conveyed unto us His Body and Blood after a divine and spiritual manner, under the forms of Bread and Wine." P. 26.

Bishop White, (quoting Bishop Bilson.)

"The more learned Jesuits themselves acknowledge that Protestants believe the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist; and our Divines deliver their faith concerning the Sacrament in this manner; "God forbid we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's Table; it is the doctrine we teach others, and comfort ourselves with." *Conference with Fisher*, p. 178.

Archbishop Laud.

"As for the Church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist."—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 294, sec. 35.

"His Altar, as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, (I say the greatest,) yea, greater than the pulpit. For there 'tis 'Hoc est Corpus meum,' 'This is My Body.' But in the pulpit 'tis at most, 'Hoc est verbum Meum,' 'This is My word.' And a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so in relation, answerably to the throne, where His Body is usually present, than to the seat where His word useth to be proclaimed."—*Speech at the Star Chamber*, 1637, p 47.

"O Lord God, hear my prayers. I come to Thee in a stedfast faith; yet for the clearness of my faith, Lord, enlighten it, for the strength of my faith, Lord, increase it. Behold, Lord, I quarrel not the words of Thy Son my Saviour's blessed Institution. I know His words are no gross, unnatural conceit, but they are Spirit and Life. While the world disputes, I believe. He hath promised me, if I come worthily, that I shall receive His most precious Body and Blood with all the fruits of His Passion."—*Devotions.*

"O Lord God, how I receive the Body and Blood of my most blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is the very wonder of my soul, yet my most firm and constant belief upon the words of my

Saviour. At this time they are graciously offered to me and my faith; Lord, make me a worthy receiver, and be it unto me as He hath said."—*Ibid.*

"As I like not those that say, He is bodily there, so I like not those that say, His Body is not there, because Christ saith it is there, and St. Paul saith it is there, and the Church of England saith it is there, and the Church of God ever said it is there; and that truly and substantially and essentially: and that not only by way of representation or commemoration; and yet without either *con, sub,* or *trans,* which the ancient Church said not: by a real, and nevertheless a spiritual and mystical and supernatural presentation and exhibition. For why should our Saviour bid us take what He would not have us receive? We must believe it is there; we must not know what is there; our faith may see it, our sense cannot; it is a mystery they all say, and it were no mystery if it were known; His Presence they determined, the manner of His Presence they determined not; they say He is there, and they say the Lord knows how. For why should we seek Him naturally in the Communion, Whom naturally we cannot find in the womb of the Virgin?" *Dr. Laurence, Sermon before the King,* p. 17, 18.

"The people were not so profane and unchristian not to perform their most humble and lowly reverence towards the most holy and sacred Altar, where Christ is most truly and really present in the blessed Sacrament, &c. Altars because they are the seats and chairs of estate, where the Lord vouchsafeth to place Himself amongst us, (*quid est enim Altare, nisi sedes Corporis et Sanguinis Christi,* as Optatus speaks?) have been in all ages so greatly honoured, and regarded of the most wise, learned, and most blessed Saints of God." *Pocklington, Altare Christianum,* p. 108. 153.

"Bishop Ridley doth not only call it the Sacrament of the Altar, affirming thus, that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the the natural Body and Blood of Christ, &c." *Heylin, Coal from the Altar,* p. 15. *quoting Ridley.*

"All sides agree in the truth with the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy receiver is by his faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real Body and Blood of Christ, truly and really. I would have no man troubled at the words truly and really, &c. Bellarmine saith, 'Protestants do often grant, that the true and

real Body of Christ is in the Eucharist, and it is most true. For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there; and that we partake of it *vere et realiter:* nor can that place by any art be shifted or by any violence wrested from Calvin's true meaning of the Presence of Christ, in and at the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist. And, for the Church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; unless A. C. can make a body no body, and blood no blood. Nay, Bishop Ridley adds yet further, 'That in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead, &c.'" *Laud's Conference with Fisher*, p. 286—296.

"And for the passages objected out of mine own Speech in Star-chamber, that they imply and necessarily infer the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the giving of divine worship to the Altar, even the same that is given to God. I answer, that neither of these can be inferred from thence; for my words only imply, that Christ's Body is truly and really present in the Sacrament; yet not corporeally, but in a spiritual manner, and so is received by us; which is no more than Master Calvin himself affirms on the 1 Cor. xi. 24. where thus he writes: *Neque enim mortis tantum et resurrectionis suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed Corpus Suum in quo passus est et resurrexit: concludo, realiter (ut vulgo loquuntur), id est, vere nobis in Cœna datur Christi Corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem;* and Master Perkins himself saith as much." *Prynne's Canterbury's Doom*, p. 514.

Bishop Forbes.

"The doctrine of those Protestants and others seems most safe and true, who are of opinion, nay most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist, and received but in a manner incomprehensible in respect of human reason and ineffable, known to God alone, and not revealed to us in the Scriptures, not cor-

poral, yet neither in the mind alone, or through faith alone, but in another way, known, as was said, to God alone, and to be left to His Omnipotence." *Consid. Modest. de Euchar.* I. i. 7.

Mede.

"It abolishes the mystery of our consolation, and that whereby our faith is strengthened in the use of these holy signs, that mankind might have an interest in Christ, and what He should do on our behalf. We know it was required He should be incarnate and take our nature upon Him, which now He hath done. Every one of us can believe that what He hath done is for the behoof of mankind; and so some men shall be the better for it, since our whole kind by reason of His Incarnation is capable of the benefits of His Passion and the whole work of redemption. But in that though Christ became man, yet He took not upon Him the nature of every several man, hence no man from His Incarnation could apply these benefits unto himself in special: for he might say, indeed Christ was made man, and so man may be the better for Him, and have some interest in Him; but since He was not incarnate into me, how should I apply this unto myself? Why therefore the all-wise God, who knew our weakness, hath so ordained in the mystery of this Holy Sacrament, that it is a mystical Incarnation of Christ into every one who receives it. Whence Gregory Nazianzen defines the Eucharist, κοινωνία ἐνσαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, *a Communion of the Incarnation of God.* For in that He affirms the Bread to be His Body, and the Wine to be His Blood; by receiving this Body and Blood of Christ, and so changing it into the substance of our body and into our blood by way of nourishment, the Body of Christ becomes our body, and His Blood is made our blood, and we become in a mystical manner flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone. And as in His conception of the Holy Virgin, He took upon Him the nature of man, that He might save man; so in His Holy Sacrament He takes upon Him the nature of every man in singular, that He might save every man who becomes Him in the Divine Sacrament of His Body and Blood. His real Incarnation was only in one, but His mystical Incarnation in many: and hence comes this Sacrament to be an instrument whereby Christ is conveyed unto us, His benefits applied, and so our faith confirmed." *Disc.* xlv. p. 254. ed. 1672.

"Now we know (Exod. xix. 13.) that no beast might touch the mountain when the Lord appeared on Mount Sinai: so none of those whom God accounts in the number of beasts (as all who have beastly affections) may approach in Christ's presence, or come unto His table.

"Wherefore, as God saith, *be ye holy, because I am Holy;* so may it be said unto all communicants, *be ye holy, because the Sacrament is holy.* (Lev. xi. 44, &c.) Whence it was a worthy custom in the ancient Churches for the Bishop or Deacon to proclaim at the Holy Communion τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, *holy things for them that are holy*, holding in his hand the Holy Sacraments. And good reason why; for where this holiness is not, there, in stead of comfort, the heart is more and more corrupted. Even as the spider gets strength of poison from the sweetest herbs and flowers; so the profane heart is strengthened in wickedness by receiving this holy and heavenly food.

"The heinousness of this sin is aggravated in respect of the thing received: for our Apostle elsewhere saith, the unworthy receiver becomes *guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ*, (1 Cor. xi. 27.) that is, he is guilty of offering contumely, injury, and indignity unto Him. St. Paul, when he dissuades husbands from misusing their wives, gives this for a reason, *no man ever yet hated his own flesh:* (Eph. v. 29.) and may not I reason thus, let no man offer injury unto Christ, because He is flesh of our flesh? yea He is our Head, and a wound or maim given to the head is more odious and dangerous than to another part. To offer violence to a common person, is a fault; to strike a magistrate, a greater; but to wound a king, who is the Lord's anointed, is a sin in the highest degree. O what a heinous sin is it then to offer violence to, and as much as in us lies to strike and wound, the Son of God, the King of Kings and the Lord of Glory!

"To be guilty of death and shedding of the blood of any innocent man, is a fearful sin; and this made David cry out, *Deliver me, O Lord, from blood-guiltiness.* (Psalm li. 14.) How fearful is it then *to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ!* Whose heart is not moved against the Jews, when he hears or reads their villanies and violence offered to our Blessed Saviour? But Chrysostom gives us a good take-heed, *Take heed* (saith he) *lest thou be guilty in the like kind, by un-*

worthy receiving of the blessed Sacrament: he that defiles the King's body, and he that tears it, offend both alike; the Jews tore it, thou defilest it. Here are (saith the same Father) *diversa peccata, sed par contumelia;* some difference of the sin, but none of the contumely therein offered.

"Joseph and Nicodemus, their pious devotion in begging and embalming the Body of Christ, is worthily recorded and commended to all generations; Mary Magdalene in bestowing that box of precious ointment upon His holy Head hath gained to herself endless honour, instead of her former infamy: so if we receive and handle worthily this mystical Body of Christ, our portion shall be with honourable Joseph and pious Mary Magdalene; our memories shall be as theirs, blessed, and our souls as theirs, to receive unspeakable comfort: but if we come unworthily, we join with Judas and the Jews, and are guilty, as they were, of the Body and Blood of Christ." Disc. xlv. p. 254, 257, 268.

Herbert.

COME ye hither all, whose taste
Is your waste;
Save your cost and mend your fare,
God is here prepared and drest,
And the feast
God in whom all dainties are

Come ye hither, all whom wine
Doth define
Naming you not to your good,
Weep what ye have drunk amiss,
And drink This
Which before ye drink is Blood.
THE INVITATION.

God to shew how far His love
Could improve,
Here, as broken, is presented.
THE BANQUET.

Archbishop Bramhall.

"Having viewed all your strength with a single eye, I find not one of your arguments that comes home to Transubstantiation, but only to a true Real Presence; which no genuine

son of the Church of England did ever deny, no, nor your adversary himself. Christ said, "This is My Body;" what He said, we do stedfastly believe. He said not, after this or that manner, *neque con, neque sub, neque trans.* And therefore we place it among the opinions of the Schools, not among the articles of our Faith. The Holy Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of peace and unity, ought not to be made the matter of strife and contention." *Works*, fol. ed. p. 15.

"We find no debates or disputes concerning the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, and much less concerning the manner of His Presence, for the first 800 years.

"Yet all the time we find as different expressions among those primitive Fathers, as among our modern writers at this day: some calling the Sacrament 'the Sign of Christ's Body'—'the Figure of His Body'—'the Symbol of His Body'—'the Mystery of His Body'—'the Exemplar,' 'Type,' and 'Representation, of His Body,' saying, 'that the Elements do not recede from their first nature;' others naming it 'the true Body and Blood of Christ,'—'changed, not in shape, but in nature;' yea, doubting not to say, that in this Sacrament 'we see Christ'—'we touch Christ'—'we eat Christ,'—'that we fasten our teeth in His very Flesh, and make our tongues red in His Blood.' Yet, notwithstanding, there were no questions, no quarrels, no contentions amongst them; there needed no Councils to order them, no conferences to reconcile them; because they contented themselves to believe what Christ had said, "This is My Body," without presuming on their own heads to determine the manner how it is His Body; neither weighing all their own words so exactly before any controversy was raised, nor expounding the sayings of other men contrary to the analogy of Faith." *Id.* p. 16.

"So grossly is he mistaken on all sides, when he saith that Protestants (he should say the English Church, if he would speak to the purpose) have a positive belief that the Sacrament is not the Body of Christ, which were to contradict the words of Christ, "This is My Body." He knows better that Protestants do not deny the thing, but the bold determination of the manner by Transubstantiation." *Id.* p. 226.

"Abate us Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequent of their determination of the manner of Presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular. They who

are ordained Priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make Them present." *Ib.* p. 485.

Bishop Cosin.

"Where is the danger and what doth he fear as long as all they that believe the Gospel own the true nature and the Real and Substantial Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, using that explication of St. Bernard concerning the manner, which he himself, for the too great evidence of truth, durst not but admit? And why doth he own that the manner is spiritual not carnal, and then require a carnal presence, as to the manner itself? As for us, we all openly profess with St. Bernard, that the Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is spiritual, and therefore true and real, and with the same Bernard and all the ancients, we deny that the Body of Christ is carnally either present or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiously forbear to enquire the manner. . . . . We confess with the Fathers, that this manner of Presence is unaccountable and past finding out, not to be searched and pryed into by reason, but believed by faith. And if it seems impossible that the Flesh of Christ should descend and come to be our food through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure His immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity, and so make our faith to conceive and believe what our reason cannot comprehend.

"Yet our faith does not cause or make that Presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the word of Christ; and the faith whereby we are said to eat the Flesh of Christ, is not that only whereby we believe that He died for our sins, (for this faith is required and supposed to precede the sacramental manducation,) but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, 'This is My Body.' Which was St. Austin's meaning when he said, "why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? Believe, and thou hast eaten." For in this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly." *Hist. of Transub.* p. 53, 54.

"All that remains is, that we should with faith and humility admire this high and sacred mystery, which our tongue cannot sufficiently explain, nor our heart conceive." *Ibid.*

Bishop Sparrow.

"The Priest says, 'Lift up your hearts.' For certainly at that hour when we are to receive the most dreadful Sacrament, it is necessary to lift up our hearts to God."

"Next is the Consecration. So you shall find in Chrysostom and Cyril last cited. Which Consecration consists chiefly in rehearsing the words of our Saviour's Institution, This is My Body, and This is My Blood, when the bread and wine is present upon the Communion Table. 'The Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,' says St. Chrysostom, 'which the Priest now makes, is the same that Christ gave to His Apostles &c.' Again, 'Christ is present at the Sacrament now, that first instituted it. He consecrates this also: it is not man that makes the Body and Blood of Christ by consecrating the holy elements, but Christ that was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the words of the Priest, but the elements are consecrated by the power and grace of God.' 'This is,' saith He, 'My Body;' by this word the bread and wine are consecrated.

"When the Priest hath said at the delivery of the Sacrament, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, the communicant is to answer Amen. By this Amen, professing his faith of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in that Sacrament."—*Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 211. 216. 220. ed. Oxford, 1840.

Hammond.

"*S. You told me even now, that you would shew me how the phrase,* "This is my Body, *in the Gospel, interpreted by, this* taking and eating is my Body," *was to be understood: perhaps it may now be time for you to pay me that debt.*

"*C.* It is a fit reason to do so; for this very phrase of St. Paul's, "*The Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Christ,*" is the key to open that difficulty, and indeed perfectly all one, of the very same importance with that. This *breaking, taking, eating of the Bread,* this whole action, is the

real communication of the Body of Christ to me, and is therefore by some ancient writers called by a word which signifies the *participation*, (communication and participation being the same, only one referred to the giver, the other to the receiver,) the very giving Christ's Body to me; that as verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in Heaven bestows on me, communicates to me the Body of the crucified Saviour. And so all that I told you of the full sense of that phrase, "*Communication of Christ's Body,*" is again to be repeated here to make up the sense of those words, "*This is My Body;*" which being so largely enlarged on, I need not now to repeat to you." *Practical Catechism*, p. 354. ed. 1715.

Bishop Fell. "Paraphrase on the Epistles."

"For this Holy Ceremony was not instituted by us for eating and drinking, but by the Lord Himself, for a sacred solemn commemoration of His death, and to be approached with all reverence and great preparation, as being the Body and Blood of the Lord." On 1 Cor. xi. 23.

Thorndike.

"Upon these premises, I am content to go to issue as concerning the sense of the Catholic Church in this point. If it can any where be shewed, that the Church did ever pray that the Flesh and Blood might be substituted instead of the elements, under the accidents of them, then I am content, that this be counted henceforth the Sacramental Presence of them in the Eucharist. But if the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements, in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His Flesh and Blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that I suppose is reason enough, to call it the Body and Blood of Christ Sacramentally, that is to say, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. It is not here to be denied, that all ecclesiastical writers do,

with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the consecration, or that to any faith, but that, upon which the Church professeth to proceed to the celebrating of it. And upon this account, when they speak of the elements, supposing the consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the name not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become." Epilogue iii. 4. p. 30.

L'Estrange's Alliance, chap. vii. page 209.
Commenting on the Form of Administration.

" *The Body of our Lord,* &c.] If you take a view of the elder forms, as they stand lateral to the Common Prayer, you may perceive this constituted by the coupling and uniting of the other two, which were before unlawfully divorced: for the first form in the first book, excluding the words commemorative of Christ's Death and Passion, which those Divine Mysteries were ordered to represent, as it is the precise formula of the Mass-Book, so might it be suspected as overserviceable to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, to which the Romanists applied it. Again, in the next Book, the Commemoration being let in, and the Body and Blood of Christ shut out, that Real Presence which all sound Protestants seem to allow, might probably be implied to be denied. Excellently well done therefore was it of Q. Elizabeth's Reformers, to link them both together; for between the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and the Sacramental Commemoration of His Passion, there is so inseparable a league, as *subsist* they cannot, unless they *consist.* A Sacramental Verity of Christ's Body and Blood there cannot be, without the Commemoration of His Death and Passion, because Christ never promised his Mysterious (yet Real) Presence, but in reference to such Commemoration: nor can there be a true Commemoration without the Body and Blood exhibited and participated; because Christ gave not those visible elements, but His Body and Blood to make that spiritual representation."

Ibid. chap. x. p. 300.

" Indeed if consecration be of any import, if with God it reconcileth any thing effectual towards the making those elements the Body and Blood of Christ, if in us it createth any

greater reverence to those dreadful Mysteries, then certainly that consecration must needs excel all others which is made in the full congregation."

Taylor.

"It was happy with Christendom, when she, in this article, retained the same simplicity which she always was bound to do in her manners and intercourse; that is, to believe the thing heartily, and not to inquire curiously; and there was peace in this article for almost a thousand years together; and yet that transubstantiation was not determined, I hope to make very evident; "In synaxi transubstantiationem serò definivit ecclesia: diù satis erat credere, sive sub pane consecrato, sive quocunque modo adesse verum Corpus Christi;" so said the great Erasmus: "It was late before the Church defined transubstantiation; for a long time together it did suffice to believe, that the true Body of Christ was present, whether under the consecrated bread or any other way:" so the thing was believed, the manner was not stood upon. And it is a famous saying of Durandus; "Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus, præsentiam credimus:' "We hear the word, we perceive the motion, we know not the manner, but we believe the presence;" and Ferus, of whom Sixtus Senensis affirms that he was 'vir nobiliter doctus, pius et eruditus,' hath these words: "Cum certum sit ibi esse Corpus Christi, quid opus est disputare, num panis substantia maneat, vel non?" "When it is certain that Christ's Body is there, what need we dispute whether the substance of bread remain or no?" And therefore Cuthbert Tonstal, Bishop of Duresme, would have every one left to his conjecture concerning the manner: "De modo quo id fieret, satius erat curiosum quemque relinquere suæ conjecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante Concilium Lateranum:" 'Before the Lateran Council, it was free for every one to opine as they please, and it were better it were so now.'—But St. Cyril would not allow so much liberty; not that he would have the manner determined, but not so much as thought upon. "Firmam fidem mysteriis adhibentes, nunquam in tam sublimibus rebus, illud *quomodo*, aut cogitemus aut proferamus." For if we go about to think it or understand it, we lose our labour. "Quomodo enim id fiat, ne in mente intelligere, nec linguâ dicere possumus, sed silentio et firmâ fide id suscipimus:" "We can perceive the thing by faith, but

cannot express it in words, nor understand it with our mind," said St. Bernard. "Oportet igitur (it is at last, after the steps of the former progress, come to be a duty), nos in sumptionibus divinorum mysteriorum, indubitatam retinere fidem, et non quærere quo pacto." The sum is this; The manner was defined but very lately: there is no need at all to dispute it; no advantages by it; and therefore it were better it were left at liberty to every man to think as he pleases, for so it was in the Church for above a thousand years together; and yet it were better, men would not at all trouble themselves concerning it; for it is a thing impossible to be understood; and therefore it is not fit to be inquired after." *Real Presence*, vol. ix. p. 421—23.

"The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants, in this article, is,—that after the Minister of the holy Mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the Bread and Wine, the symbols become changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual real manner: so that all that worthily communicate, do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His Passion: the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the Blood of the covenant, by using It as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this: It is bread, and it is Christ's Body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the Sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they can; Christ as Christ can be given; the Bread and Wine as they can; and to the same real purposes, to which they are designed: and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements do the body." *Ibid.* 424.

"This may suffice for the word 'real,' which the English Papists much use, but, as it appears, with much less reason than the sons of the Church of England: and when the Real Presence is denied, the word 'real' is taken for 'natural,' and does not signify 'transcendenter,' or in his just and most proper signification. But the word 'substantialiter' is also used by Protestants in this question, which I suppose may be the same with that which is in the Article of Trent, "Sacramentaliter præsens Salvator substantiâ suâ nobis adest." 'in substance, but after a Sacramental manner:' which words if they might be understood

in the sense in which the Protestants use them, that is, really, truly, without fiction or the help of fancy, but 'in rei veritate,' so, as Philo calls spiritual things ἀναγκαιότατοι οὐσίαι, 'most necessary, useful, and material substances,' it might become an instrument of a united confession." . . . . *Ibid.* p. 427.

"One thing more I am to note in order to the same purposes; that, in the explication of this question, it is much insisted upon, that it be inquired whether, when we say we believe Christ's Body to be 'really' in the Sacrament, we mean, "that Body, that Flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary," that was crucified, dead, and buried? I answer, I know none else that He had, or hath: there is but one Body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says, that Body is glorified, which was crucified, says it is the same Body, but not after the same manner: and so it is in the Sacrament; we eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood, of Christ; but though it is the same which we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner: and therefore, when any of the Protestant divines, or any of the fathers, deny that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that which was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament,—as Bertram, as St. Jerome, as Clemens Alexandrinus, expressly affirm; the meaning is easy;—they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense; and then calling it 'corpus spirituale,' the word 'spiritual' is not a substantial predication, but is an affirmation of the manner, though, in disputation, it be made the predicate of a proposition, and the opposite member of a distinction. 'That Body which was crucified, is not that Body that is eaten in the Sacrament,'—if the intention of the proposition be to speak of the eating It in the same manner of being; but 'that Body which was crucified, the same Body we do eat,'—if the intention be to speak of the same thing in several manners of being and operating: and this I noted, that we may not be prejudiced by words, when the notion is certain and easy: and thus far is the sense of our doctrine in this article." *Ibid.* 430.

"In this Feast all Christ, and Christ's Passion, and all His graces, the blessings and effects of His sufferings, are conveyed." *Holy Living*, vol. iv. p 268.

"When the holy man stands at the Table of Blessing, and ministers the rite of Consecration, then do as the Angels do,

who behold and love and wonder that the Son of God should become Food to the souls of His servants; that He who cannot suffer any change or lessening should be broken into pieces and enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit, and yet remain in heaven whilst He descends to thee upon earth; that He who hath essential felicity should become miserable and die for thee, and then give Himself to thee, for ever to redeem thee from sin and misery." *Ibid.* p. 269.

"Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises, send Thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon these gifts, that by His good, His holy, His glorious Presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and He may bless and sanctify these gifts,

That this Bread may become the Holy Body of Christ.
Amen.

And this Chalice may become the life-giving Blood of Christ.
Amen."

Office for the Holy Communion, vol. xv. p. 299.

"In the act of receiving, exercise acts of faith with much confidence and resignation, believing it not to be common bread and wine, but holy in their use, holy in their signification, holy in their change, and holy in their effect: and believe, if thou art a worthy communicant, thou dost as verily receive Christ's Body and Blood to all effects and purposes of the Spirit, as thou dost receive the blessed elements into thy mouth, that thou puttest thy finger to His hand, and thy hand into His side, and thy lips to His fontinel of blood, sucking life from His heart; and yet if thou dost communicate unworthily, thou eatest and drinkest Christ to thy danger, and death, and destruction. Dispute not concerning the secret of the mystery, and the nicety of the manner of Christ's Presence; it is sufficient to thee, that Christ shall be present to thy soul, as an instrument of grace, as a pledge of the resurrection, as the earnest of glory and immortality, and a means of many intermedial blessings, even all such as are necessary for thee, and are in order to thy salvation. And to make all this good to thee, there is nothing necessary on thy part but a holy life, and a true belief of all the sayings of Christ; amongst which, indefinitely assent to the words of institution, and believe that Christ, in the Holy Sacrament, gives thee His Body and His Blood. He that believes

not this, is not a Christian. He that believes so much, needs not to inquire further, nor to entangle his faith by disbelieving his sense." *Holy Living*, vol. iv. p. 172.

" And therefore the Christian ministry having greater privileges, and being honoured with attrectation of the Body and Blood of Christ, and offices serving to a better covenant, may with greater argument be accounted excellent, honourable, and royal." *Divine Institution of Office Ministerial*, t. 5. §. 9. vol. xiv. 457.

Bishop Ken.

" I believe, O crucified Lord, that the Bread which we break in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries is the communication of Thy Body, and the Cup of blessing which we bless is the communication of Thy Blood, and that Thou dost as effectually and really convey Thy Body and Blood to our souls by the Bread and Wine, as Thou didst Thy Holy Spirit by Thy breath to Thy disciples, for which all love, all glory be to Thee.

" Lord, what need I labour in vain to search out the manner of Thy mysterious Presence in the Sacrament, when my love assures me Thou art there? All the faithful who approach Thee, with prepared hearts, they well know Thou art there, they feel the virtue of divine love going out of Thee to heal their infirmities and to inflame their affections; for which all love, all glory be to Thee.

" O God Incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy Flesh to eat and Thy Blood to drink; how Thy Flesh is meat indeed; how Thou who art in heaven, art present on the Altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because Thou hast said it, and I firmly rely on Thy love and on Thy Omnipotence to make good Thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend." *Exposition of the Church Catechism.*

Bishop Hackett.

" That which astonisheth the communicant and ravisheth his heart is, that this Feast afford no worse meat than the Body and Blood of our Saviour. These He gave for the life of the world, these are the repast of this Supper, and these we truly partake. For there is not only the visible reception of the outward signs, but an invisible reception of the thing signified.

There is far more than a shadow, than a type, than a figure. Christ did not propose a sign at that hour, but also he gave us a Gift, and that Gift really and effectually is Himself, which is all one as you would say, spiritually Himself; for spiritual union is the most true and real union that can be. That which is promised, and faith takes it, and hath it, is not fiction, fancy, opinion, falsity, but substance and verity. Therefore it cannot choose but that a real union must follow between Christ and us, as there is a union of all parts of the body by the animation of one soul. . . . But faith is the mouth wherewith we eat His Body and drink His Blood, not the mouth of a man, but of a faithful man, for we hunger after Him not with a corporeal appetite but a spiritual, therefore our eating must be spiritual, and not corporeal. Yet this is a real substantial partaking of Christ crucified, broken, His Flesh bleeding, His wounds gaping: so He is exhibited, so we are sure to receive Him, which doth not only touch our outward senses in the elements, but pass through into the depth of the soul. For in true divinity real and spiritual are æquipollent: . . . 'A mystery neither to be set out in words, nor to be comprehended sufficiently in the mind, but to be adored by faith,' says Calvin." *Christian Consolations, Bp. Taylor's Works*, ed. Heber, vol. i. p. 162.

Bishop Beveridge.

"When we hear the words of Consecration repeated as they came from our Lord's own mouth, "This is My Body which is given for you," and "This is My Blood which was shed for you and for many for the remission of sins;" we are then stedfastly to believe, that although the substance of the Bread and Wine still remain, yet now it is not common bread and wine, as to its use; but the Body and Blood of Christ in that Sacramental sense wherein He spake the words. . . . When it comes to our turn to receive it, then we are to lay aside all thoughts of bread and wine, and the Minister and every thing else that is or can be seen, and fix our faith, as it is "the evidence of things not seen," wholly and solely upon our blessed Saviour, as offering us His own Body and Blood to preserve our bodies and souls to everlasting life, which we are therefore to receive by faith, as it is "the substance of things hoped for," stedfastly believing it to be,

as our Saviour said, "His Body and Blood," which our Church teacheth us are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." *Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion*, p. 204, 5. ed. 1721.

"Whereby He plainly signified, that what He now gave them to eat and drink, He would have them look upon it, and receive it, not as common bread and wine, but as His Body and Blood; the one as broken, the other as shed, for their sins." *Catechism*, p. 125.

"Hence also it is, that our Church requires us to receive the Holy Sacrament kneeling, not out of any respect to the creatures of Bread and Wine, but to put us in mind that Almighty God our Creator and Redeemer, the only object of all religious worship, is there specially present, offering His own Body and Blood to us, that so we may act our faith in Him, and express our sense of His goodness to us, and our unworthiness of it, in the most humble posture that we can. And indeed, could the Church be sure that all her members would receive as they ought with faith, she need not to command them to receive it kneeling: for they could not do it any other way: for how can I pray in faith to Almighty God, to preserve both my body and soul to everlasting life, and not make my body, as well as soul, bow down before Him? How can I by faith behold my Saviour coming to me, and offering me His own Body and Blood, and not fall down and worship Him? How can I by faith lay hold upon the pardon of my sins, as there sealed and delivered to me, and receive it any otherwise than upon my knees? I dare not, I cannot do it. And they who can, have too much cause to suspect, that they do not discern the Lord's Body, and therefore cannot receive it worthily. Be sure, our receiving the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, as the Catholic Church always did, in an humble and adoring posture, is both an argument and excitement of our faith in Him. By it we demonstrate, that we discern the Lord's Body, and believe Him to be present with us in a particular sacramental sense, and by it we excite and stir up both ourselves and others to act our faith more stedfastly upon Him, in that by our adoring Him, we actually acknowledge Him to be God, as well as man; and therefore on whom we have all the reason in the world to believe and trust for our salvation." *On Frequent Communion*, p. 208.

Bp. Bull.

"We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become, and are made the Body and Blood of Christ. But we know also, that though they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant from the doctrine of transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal Benediction, the Spirit of Christ or a divine virtue from Christ descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be and are the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in Heaven, being virtually united to the elements of Bread and Wine on earth. Which also seemsto be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is prayed that God would send down his Spirit upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist." *Answer to Bossuet. Hickes's Controversial Discourses*, vol. i. p. 249

Hickes.

"Nay I maintain, that no other interpretation of these words (St. Luke xxii. 18. the words of institution) can be invented, which shall either be more probable than this of ours, or more suitable to the purpose of our Saviour. And indeed that this is the true and only meaning of the text, I conclude from hence, that the Primitive Church always taught and understood it in this sense. And this I will now make good by a cloud of most unquestionable witnesses.

"And first let us hear St. Irenæus, St. Polycarp's contemporary, a most egregious assertor of Apostolic Tradition. In his fourth Book, being to prove against the Marcionites that Jesus Christ was the Son of the One true God, who made the world, and instituted the law of Moses for the Jews, he draws his argument from the oblation of the Eucharist: and our opinion, says he, "is agreeable to the Eucharist, and the Eucharist does reciprocally confirm our opinion: for we offer unto the Lord those things which are His, congruously declaring the commu-

nication and the unity both of the Flesh and Spirit." And then follow these words: "For as the Bread which is from the earth, partaking of the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly: so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer mere corruptible bodies, but have hope of a resurrection." In this passage the holy father does most expressly assert, that the Bread is made the Eucharist, that is, the Body of Jesus Christ by invocation of God, to wit by consecration, as will appear more fully in the sequel. In his fifth book the same holy father disputes against Valentinus; and maintains, that Jesus Christ assumed the human nature truly and really, and not only in appearance, as some heretics dreamt And to prove this also, he applies the Sacrament of the Eucharist. "And thus," says he, "to wit, according to these things, neither has the Lord redeemed us with His Blood; nor is the Cup of the Eucharist the communication of His Blood; nor the Bread which we break the communication of His Body:" and a little after he has these words: "when therefore both the Bread broken, and the Cup mixed, have partaken of the Word of God, they become the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ." *Christian Priesthood,* App. p. cccclxxxii.

Dean Comber.

"Only we must note, that this Amen in the end of this [Consecration] prayer was anciently spoken by the people with a loud voice; not only to shew their joining in the desire that the elements may become truly consecrated, but also to declare their firm belief that they are now to be esteemed as the very Body and Blood of Christ; let us therefore here most devoutly seal all that the priest hath done, and unfeignedly testify our faith by a hearty *Amen.* "Lord, it is done as Thou hast commanded, and I doubt not but the mystery is rightly accomplished; I am persuaded that here is that which my soul longeth after, a crucified Saviour communicating Himself to poor penitent sinners. O let me be reckoned among that number, and then I shall assuredly receive Thee, Holy Jesus. Amen." *Companion to the Temple,* vol. i. fol. p. 543.

"Still we do believe that every duly disposed communicant doth receive really the Body and Blood of Christ, in

and by these elements, but it is by faith and not by sense. If we receive them in the manner, and to the end which Christ appointed, they give us a lively remembrance of His love and all-sufficient merit, and thereby invite our faith to embrace this crucified Redeemer, as the satisfaction for our sins; whereupon He (who is most ready to close with penitent sinners) doth by this rite of His own appointing, give Himself and the salutary benefits of His death unto such, and although the manner be mysterious, yet the advantages are real, and the effect more certain than if we eat or drank His natural flesh and blood." *Ib.* p. 540.

An act of faith.

"O Eternal Word of God, by whose power all things were made, I will not ask how Thou canst give me Thy Flesh to eat; because I am abundantly satisfied in Thy saying, "This is My Body:" since Thou canst make it become to me whatsoever Thou sayest it is. I believe, Lord, help my unbelief! What though my senses assure me, the outward substance and its accidents still remain; yet my faith and my experience tell me there is an efficacy therein, beyond the power of any other thing. Alas! the Flesh would profit me nothing, John iv. 63. for he that is joined to Thee must be one spirit, 1 Cor. vi. 17. O let these sacred Symbols therefore make me partaker of Thy nature, and a partner in Thy merits: let them unite me to Thee, ingraft me in Thee, and make That Body mine which did suffer death for me, and then I shall seek no further, but be more happy than if I could understand all mysteries: sure I am, This is Thy Body in Sacrament, it communicates to us the blessings and benefit thereof, and though presented in a figure. and by a holy rite, yet it is to all its purposes that which it doth represent; I will therefore receive it as Thy Body, and esteem it infinitely above all other food, that I may not be judged for not discerning Thy Body. O let it be unto me according to my faith. Amen." *Ib.* p. 547.

"It will not suffice me, dearest Saviour, to receive Thee in part only, for I must be wholly Thine, and (blessed be Thy Name) Thou art willing to be wholly mine also. Thou hast already given me Thy Holy Body to cleanse my nature, and now Thou art preparing Thy precious Blood to wash away my guilt. My sins have poured out every drop thereof, wherefore Thou

presentest it to me itself, to shew how truly Thou didst suffer death for me. And now, O my Redeemer, Thou hast said, This Cup is the Communion of Thy blood, and Thy truth is unquestionable, Thy power is infinite, and Thy love was such, that Thou gavest thy heart's-blood for me. I will receive it therefore as the blood of the Everlasting Covenant, the seal of all the promises of Thy Holy Gospel"

"The second happiness assured by this Holy Eucharist is, that we are thereby united to Jesus, so as to have fellowship with Him, 1 John i. 3. and in St. Paul's phrase we do thereby become members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bone, Eph. v. 30. for He gives us Himself to be our food, with intent that He may be one with us, and we with Him. As some have made their leagues of friendship by drinking each other's blood, thereby intending to create a sympathy, and as it were to mingle souls: and since we have been fed with that Food, with which God feeds his dearest children, and have participated of that Spirit which quickens the great mystical body of Christ, 1 Cor. xii. 9. we may infer, that we are living members of the true Church also: let us therefore solace ourselves with reflecting upon the happiness of our present estate."

"The third benefit which worthy receivers have by this Sacrament is, that it doth consign them to a blessed immortality and this follows from the former, it being impossible any true member of Christ should be left for ever in the grave; since the Head liveth, the members shall live also, John vi. 64. hence the Fathers called it an antidote against death, and the means to make us partakers of our Lord's immortality. For Jesus doth not only here refresh our souls with a present communication of His graces, but doth seal that covenant also, one condition of which is, that He will bring us to glory." *Ib.* p. 566, 7.

Archbishop Wake.

"The Bread which we break is, not only in figure and similitude, but by a real spiritual Communion, His Body. The Cup of Blessing which we bless is by the same Communion His Blood." *On the Catechism*, sect. 49.

Johnson.

"Nor can I conceive how the words of St. Paul can otherwise be understood, in their full scope and latitude, when he says, "The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion?" &c. 1 Cor. x. 16. He supposes that the Body and Blood of Christ are communicated to us by the Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist . . . . And when St. Paul saith that ignorant and profane communicants "do not discern the Lord's Body" in the Holy Eucharist, (1 Cor. xi. 29.) and that "they are guilty of" (an indignity toward) "the Body and Blood of our Lord," ver. 27. he surely takes it for granted that the Body and Blood are actually there, whether they discern it or not . . . .

"I believe there is nothing that can more inflame and exalt the devotion of a sincere Christian, than to think and believe, that when he is praying at God's Altar and receiving the Holy Eucharist, he has the price of his redemption in his hand, or lying before his eyes," *Propitiatory Oblation*, pp. 28, 101.

"The full and true notion of the Eucharist is, that it is a religious Feast upon Bread and Wine, that have been first offered in sacrifice to Almighty God, and are become the mysterious Body and Blood of Christ" *Unbloody Sacrifice*, vol. ii. p. 18.

"It was the universal belief of the ancients, that, by the special presence of the Holy Spirit, the Bread and Wine were made the Body and Blood of Christ, in life and power, as they were before in figure or representation. As the natural Body of Christ was formed in the womb by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; so they expected, and prayed, that, by the operation of the same Spirit, the Bread and Wine might be made the Body and Blood, in a more effectual manner than they were, when offered to God as mere representatives: and it was their certain belief that the Bread thus consecrated by the secret influence of the Spirit, was the very Body of Christ in power, and energy, and to all intents and purposes of religion, and so far as it was possible for one thing to be made another, without change of substance. This was indeed no Article of their Creed, because the Creed was originally drawn not for communicants, but to be rehearsed by persons that were to be baptized, or their sureties. But it was an Article to which all communicants gave their consent so oft as they received. For

the Priest of old said, at the delivery of the Bread to every single communicant, "The Body of Christ:" and every communicant answered, Amen; by which he was understood to give his consent to what the Priest said. And in the same manner they acknowledge the sacramental Wine to be the Blood of Christ. The primitive Church believed not any change of substance in the Sacrament. For they ever affirmed the Bread and Wine to remain after consecration; but that by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost they were Christ's Body and Blood, not only by way of type, or figure, but in real power and effect.

"And we are to observe that, in the institution, Christ says of the Bread, "This is My Body;" of the Cup, or Wine, "This is My Blood," without adding any words to abate the signification of that expression. He calls the sacramental Bread My Flesh, five times in six verses in this chapter, from which I take my text, beginning at verse 51, ending at verse 56: nay, He calls it *My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,* verse 51. And it appears under this pledge of Bread He did actually offer His Body to the Father for the redemption of mankind. See sect. 6. and so on to the 9th, discourse ii. And He calls the Cup, or Wine, *His Blood,* four times within the compass of four verses, beginning at the 53d, ending at the 56th. He knew full well what captious hearers He had, and that they were upon the point of deserting Him on this account; yet He does not forbear to speak the mystery, as that mystery deserved. St. Paul tells them that unworthily received the Sacrament, that they were "*guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord;*" and the same Apostle says of the Cup, that it is "*the Communion of the Blood of Christ;*" and of the Bread, that it is "*the Communion of the Body of Christ,*" without any mollifying addition. We are not therefore to wonder that the primitive Church made this an Article of faith, though not of their Creed.

"And the consecrated Bread and Wine being thus, by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit, made the Body and Blood of Christ, did fully answer the characters which Christ gives us of His Flesh and Blood in this 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel." *Primitive Communicant,* p. 141—144.

"And I am firmly persuaded that this is the sum of what Christ teacheth us in this chapter: and I cannot doubt of it when I consider, that this was the belief of all Christians in the first and purest ages.

"To believe this doctrine, is indeed a "work," or "labour," so our Saviour justly calls it. A great part of those who first heard it, could not be persuaded that it was possible for Him, in any good sense to give His Flesh to be eat, His Blood to be drank; or that, if He could, the benefit of eating and drinking them, could be so great as He had promised; therefore *they went away, and walked no more with Him,* ver. 66. Christ foreknew what corrupt glosses men of latter ages would put upon His words, and how difficult it would be for private Christians to break through prejudices, and mistakes, made current by the countenance and traditions of great men. And perhaps there is no one point in our religion that requires more labour, and study, to be rightly informed in, at this day, than this of which I am now speaking; I mean, the true discerning of our Lord's Body in the Holy Sacrament, and the benefits promised to them who receive it, in this sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. *Ibid.* p. 176.

Archbishop Sharp.

"But what then? Do we not in the Sacrament truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ? God forbid that any one should deny it. There is none that understands any thing of the Sacrament but must acknowledge, that therein to all worthy receivers the Body and Blood of Christ is both given and likewise received by them. This is the sense of the Church of England, when she doth so often declare that she owns the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all that worthily receive the Sacrament.

"We do indeed own that Christ is really present in the Sacrament to all worthy receivers, and in our Communion Service we pray to God to grant that we may eat the Flesh of His dear Son and drink His Blood, &c. All this we own, and it is very necessary we should." *Sermon on Transubstantiation,* vol. vii.

Leslie.

"Nor can the shewbread in the temple be called the bread of our God so properly, so strictly, so eminently, as the Bread in the Holy Sacrament, which is the Body of Christ . . . . And does not then holiness and honour belong as much, at least, to the Evangelical Priesthood, who offer this Bread of our God, as the priests under the Law who set the shewbread upon the holy table in the temple? And is not the one as properly the

office of a priest as the other?" *Regale and Pontificate. Works,* vol. i. p. 665.

Brett.

"We may ask again, if it be not convenient, nay necessary, that all those who partake of this holy Sacrament should understand and know what it is they do? Ought they not to be instructed in the nature and design of it, lest they eat and drink unworthily, not discerning the Lord's Body? And how shall they discern the Lord's Body, if they are not taught that the Lord's Body is here present?" *Sermon on the Christian Altar and Sacrifice,* p. xii.

"*Verse* 55. He says, *My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed.* That Flesh and Blood of Mine which I but now promised you that *I will give for the life of the world,* is indeed true life-giving meat and drink. *He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me and I in him.* He is in Me as a member of My Mystical Body, and I in him by imparting to him of My life-giving Spirit. *As the living Father sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me shall live by Me.* As the Father (see John v. 26.) hath life in Himself which He received from no other, and has given to Me His Son to have life in Myself, so I will impart true life to him that feeds on Me. *This is that Bread which came down from Heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever.* The Bread which I purpose to give you is true heavenly Bread, not like that which was rained down in the wilderness, which though your fathers eat plentifully of it, yet they died in their sins; but this Bread shall cleanse you from sin, and by the virtue of it those who feed upon it shall live for ever. *These things said He in the synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum. Many therefore of His disciples when they heard this, said, This is an hard saying, who can hear it?* Who can believe that we must become cannibals and feed upon this Man's Flesh and Blood? or without such feeding must be deprived of eternal life or happiness? *When Jesus knew in Himself that His Disciples murmured at it, He said unto them, Does this offend you?* Do you stumble at this? Does the faith you have pretended to have now fail you? *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?* Will ye not then think the feeding on my Flesh more incredible than you do now? For how can you feed upon it when it is here no

more? Therefore I will a little explain Myself and tell you, that *it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing:* bare flesh and blood without life and spirit in them can quicken or give life to nothing. *The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* The promises that I have made you concerning giving you my Flesh and Blood to eat and drink, if you had attended to them, might have satisfied you that I spake of such Flesh and Blood as should have a quickening Spirit conveyed with them. For I plainly told you, that as *I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, shall live by Me;* I will quicken or give him life by My Spirit, that Spirit by which My Body lives, and whose quickening or life-giving virtue I will impart to that material thing which I shall make my Body and Blood, when I give this natural Body and Blood of Mine *for the life of the world,* or the redemption of mankind. It is not Christ's doctrine that quickens and gives us life, but His Spirit, that Spirit which gave life to His own Body, and which together with His Body and Blood, or something which He dignifies with that name, which He has appointed to give us life. The Body and Blood then, or Flesh and Blood, which in this chapter He promised to give (saying, *My flesh which I will give*) for our food which should nourish us unto eternal life, can be no other than that Bread and Wine which He gave when He instituted the Holy Eucharist or Lord's Supper, at which time he dignified them with the name and virtue of His Body and Blood. And so the holy and most ancient Fathers (who lived nearest to the Apostles' days, and therefore best understood the Apostles' language and doctrine, consequently could best expound them) have interpreted this passage, as appears from St. Ignatius particularly, who being the disciple of St. John who wrote the Gospel where alone this discourse of our Saviour is recorded, is to be preferred to all other expositors; and he tells us, as I have before observed, that the Holy Eucharist is the medicine of immortality, our antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Christ Jesus." *Scripture Account of the Holy Eucharist,* p. 113.

"Now by comparing these words (the words of institution) of our Saviour which He spake when he communicated this Bread and Wine to His disciples, and called those elements His Body and Blood, with those He before spake in the sixth chapter of St. John, which I have already proved were spoken with relation to the Holy Eucharist; for in that chapter, ver. 51. *The*

Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world; we may thus paraphrase them; "you may remember that some time ago when I taught in Capernaum, and the Jews there told me of their fathers eating manna in the desert, which they called Bread from heaven, upon which I promised them, that if they would believe in Me, I would give them true Bread from Heaven, which should nourish them unto eternal life; and that this Bread was My own Flesh and Blood; they thought this a hard saying, thinking that I intended they should eat that natural Flesh they then saw, and that natural Blood then and still in My veins. I did not then think it proper to explain Myself any farther to them than to tell them, that what I had said was to be understood in a spiritual sense, *That it is the Spirit that quickeneth; the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* But now I will make good that promise to you; here is Bread and Wine, which I have now offered to God, and have blessed them with My Spirit, and thereby made them My Body and Blood in power and virtue: these I now give to you, eat the one and drink the other, and you shall receive all the benefits and blessings you then heard Me promise to those who should eat My Flesh and drink My Blood, *I will raise you up at the last day,* and *you shall dwell in Me and I in you.*" And that the Church of England (to whose Book of Common Prayer this author gave his assent and consent when he was first admitted to a cure of souls in London) believes the sixth chapter of St. John to relate to the Holy Eucharist, is plain, for it is upon the authority of that chapter only that she can say in her Exhortation to her communicants, that "If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us:" for there is no other place of Scripture but the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel where this doctrine is to be learnt." *Ibid.* p. 137.

Wheatley.

"In these words [of the Consecration Prayer, "Hear us, O merciful Father," &c.] the sense of the former is still implied, and consequently by these the elements are now consecrated, and so become the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ." c. vi. s. xxii. p. 301. Oxf. ed. 1819.

"A *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, is what our Church frequently asserts in this very office of Communion, in her Articles, in her Homilies, and her Catechism: particularly in the two latter, in the first of which she tells us, *Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent;—but the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost—is through Faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, &c. who therefore* (as she farther instructs us in the Catechism) *verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.* This is the doctrine of our Church in relation to the *Real Presence* in the Sacrament, entirely different from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which she here, as well as elsewhere, disclaims." *Ib.* s. xxxi. p. 330.

Bishop Wilson.

"We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this Bread and this Cup.

"We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies, beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ: and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.

"And, together with us, remember, O God, for good, the whole mystical Body of Thy Son: that such as are yet alive may finish their course with joy; and that we, with all such as are dead in the Lord, may rest in hope and rise in glory, for Thy Son's sake, whose death we now commemorate. Amen.

"May I always receive the Holy Sacrament in the same meaning, intention, and blessed effect, with which Jesus Christ administered it to His Apostles in His last Supper." *Sacra Privata*, p. 93, 94.

"If therefore he ask how often he should receive this Sacrament, he ought to have an answer in the words of an ancient writer: 'Receive it as often as you can, that the old 'serpent, seeing the blood of the true Paschal Lamb upon your 'lips, may tremble to approach you.'" *Parochialia*, ed. 1840. p. 63.

Grabe.

"The English Divines teach, that in the Holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species, that is, the signs, of Bread and Wine, are offered to God, and become a representation of the Sacrifice of Christ once made upon the Cross, whereby God may be rendered propitious." *Daniel Brevint, &c. Jeremy Taylor. MS. Adversaria,* printed Tract 81. p. 368.

Bishop of Exeter.

"When any of us speak of this great mystery in terms best suited to its spiritual nature; when, for instance, we speak of the real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, there is raised a cry, as if we were symbolizing with the Church of Rome, and as if this Presence, because it is real, can be nothing else than the gross, carnal, corporeal, presence indicated in Transubstantiation. Now here, as with respect to Baptism, I will not argue the point, but will merely refer to the language of our Church in those authorized declarations of its doctrine to which we have assented, and in those formularies which we have both expressly approved and solemnly engaged to use.

"It is very true, that none of these declarations or formularies use the phrase 'real Presence;' and therefore, if any should attempt to impose the use of that phrase as necessary, he would be justly open to censure for requiring what the Church does not require. But, on the other hand, if we adopt the phrase, as not only aptly expressing the doctrine of the Church, but also as commended to our use by the practice of the soundest Divines of the Church of England, in an age more distinguished for depth, as well as soundness, of Theology than the present—such as Abp. Bramhall, Sharp, and Wake, (all of whom do not only express their own judgment, but also are witnesses of the general judgment of the Church in and before their days; 'No genuine son of the Church of England,' says Bramhall, 'did ever deny a true real Presence;') if, I say, we adopt the phrase, used by such men as these, and even by some of those, who at the Reformation sealed with their blood their testimony to the Truth against the doctrine of Rome, (I allude especially to Bishops Ridley and Latimer—and even to Cranmer, who, when he avoided the phrase so abused by the Romanists, did yet employ equivalent

words,) it will be sufficient for the justification both of them and of us to shew, that the language of the Church itself does in fact express the same thing though in different terms. Still, I fully admit, that Christian discretion would bid us forbear from the use of the phrase, if the objection to it were founded on a sincere apprehension of giving offence to tender consciences; and not, as there is too much reason to believe, on an aversion to the great truth which it is employed to express." *Charge*, p. 69—71.

The following summary of the "Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist" is added, not with any view of introducing the respected Author into the controversy, but as extracted from a work which since the publication of the first Edition has received the sanction of the most Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh, to whom it is, with permission, inscribed.

"This Catholic and Apostolic Church has always avoided any attempt to determine too minutely the mode of the true Presence in the Holy Eucharist. Guided by Scripture, she establishes only those truths which Scripture reveals, and leaves the subject in that mystery, with which God for His wise purposes has invested it. Her doctrine concerning the true Presence appears to be limited to the following points:—

"Taking as her immoveable foundation the words of Jesus Christ: "This is My Body.....This is My Blood, of the new Covenant;" and "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life;" she believes, that the Body or Flesh, and the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one Person, are verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, under the outward sign or form of Bread and Wine, which is, on this account, the "partaking or communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." She believes that the Eucharist is not the sign of an *absent* body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure, or shadow, or sign of Christ's Body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist, not only the Flesh and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, both God and man.

"Resting on these words, "The Bread which we break is it

not the communion of the Body of Christ?" and again, " I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine;" she holds that the nature of the Bread and Wine continues after consecration, and therefore rejects transubstantiation, or "*the* change of the substance" which supposes the nature of bread entirely to cease by consecration.

"As a necessary consequence of the preceding truths, and admonished by Christ Himself, " It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are Spirit and they are life;" she holds that the Presence (and therefore the eating) of Christ's Body and Blood, though true, is altogether " heavenly and spiritual," of a kind which is inexplicable by any carnal or earthly experience or imagination: even as the Sonship of the Eternal Word of God, and His Incarnation, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit, are immeasurable by human understandings.

" Believing according to the Scriptures, that Christ ascended in His natural Body into Heaven, and shall only come from thence at the end of the world; she rejects, for this reason, as well as the last, any such real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood as is " corporal" or organical, that is, according to the known and earthly mode of existence of a body.

"Resting on the Divine promise, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life," she regards it as the more pious and probable opinion, that the wicked, those who are totally devoid of true and living faith, do not partake of the Holy Flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, God withdrawing from them so " divine" a gift, and not permitting His enemies to partake of it. And hence she holds, that such a faith is "the means by which the Body of Christ is received and eaten," " a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies;" because it is the essential qualification on our parts, without which that Body is not received; and because " without faith it is impossible to please God."

" Following the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, and supported by their authority, she believes that " the blessing," or " consecration" of the Bread and Wine is not without effect, but that it operates a real change: for when the Sacrament is thus perfected, she regards it as so "divine a thing," so "heavenly a food," that we must not "*presume*" to approach it with unprepared minds, and that sinners, although they only

partake of the Bread and Wine, partake of them to their own *condemnation,* because they impiously disregard the Lord's Body, which is truly present in that Sacrament. Hence it is that the Church believing firmly in the real Presence of the "precious and blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ," speaks of the Eucharist as "high and holy mysteries," exhorts us to consider the "dignity of that holy mystery," that "heavenly feast," that "holy table," "the banquet of that most heavenly food," even "the King of kings' table."

"Such is the simple, the sublime, and, what is more, the true and scriptural doctrine of our Catholic and Apostolic Church—a doctrine which cannot be accused of heresy except from ignorance or uncharitableness. Even our adversaries are compelled sometimes by the force of truth to clear the Church of England from the imputation of disbelieving the sublime mysteries of this Holy Sacrament, and reducing it to a common spiritual exercise, in which the mind of the individual derives edification, and perhaps grace, from the contemplation and remembrance of an absent Redeemer's sufferings.

"Our doctrine leaves this subject in the sacred mystery with which God has enveloped it. It is not to be denied that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation facilitates the mental conception of that mystery: but it has the fatal defect of being opposed to the plain language of Scripture; and if those statements are to be explained away, and reduced to merely figurative expressions, according to the doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus and his school; the Berengarians, Zuinglians, and Socinians, may with reason claim a similar privilege of arbitrarily explaining away into figures the very passages in which the doctrine of the true Presence itself is conveyed.

"The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is entirely founded on human reasoning from the nature of bodies, and the supposed incompatibility of the scriptural statement that the Eucharist is Bread and Wine, literally understood, with the other expressions of Scripture. But what Bossuet has observed of the philosophical reasonings of the School of Zurich and Geneva against the real Presence, "que les reçevoir en matière de religion, c'est détruire non seulement le mystère de l'eucharistie, mais tout d'un coup tous les mystères du Christianisme," is perfectly applicable to those of Romanists for their transubstantiation." *Palmer's Treatise on the Church,* vol. ii. p. 526—533.

INDEX

TO THE ENGLISH WRITERS QUOTED.

HOLY Eucharist—Benefits of the use of the high language of the ancient Catholic Fathers in commending it to their people. *Homilies*, title page reverse.

Sayings of the Fathers acknowledged specifically, *Bp. Ridley*, p. 35, 6. *Dr. Donne*, p. 49, 50.

Churches of England and Rome differ therein, not as to the Real Presence, but as to the mode of its being, *Bp. Ridley*, p. 34. *Sutton*, p. 55, 6. *Bp. Morton*, p. 43. *Bp. Overall*, p. 42. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 43. *Abp. Bramhall*, p. 63. *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 69.

Against enquiring into the mode, *Hooker*, p. 37, 39. *Sutton*, p. 53. *Bp. Forbes*, p. 59. *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 68, 71. *Bp. Ken*, p. 72. (See also next head.)

Our Lord's words "This is My Body" to be believed; the mode whereby it is so, not to be enquired into, but received as a mystery. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 43, 4. *Sutton*, p. 53. *Abp. Laud*, p. 57. *Laurence*, (*ap. Prynne*,) p. 58. *Abp. Bramhall*, p. 63. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71. *Dean Comber*, p. 77. (Comp. *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. *Hooker*, p. 38.)

The Eucharist no untrue sign of a thing absent. *Homilies*, p. 33. (Comp. *Bp Ridley*, p. 34.) presents us with what it represents. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 48.

The very, true, natural Body and Blood of Christ which was born, ascended, is at God's right hand, shall return to judge, is in the Sacrament, *Bp. Ridley*, p. 34. (alleged by *Abp. Laud*, p. 59. *Heylin*, p. 58.) the flesh wherein our Redeemer was seen and suffered and paid the price of our redemption. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 46. the same Body and Flesh, which was born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified, dead, and buried; the Body and Blood of Christ that was broken and poured forth, *Bp. Taylor*, p. 70. Christ giveth us in the Sacrament that Flesh which He gave for us in Sacrifice: *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 45. that Blood which our sins shed, *Comber*, p. 77, 8. His Body and Blood, the one as broken, the other as shed for our sins, *Bp. Beveridge*, p. 74.

The Body and Blood of Christ are really and substantially present in the Holy Eucharist, *Bp. Overall*, p. 42. English Divines, *ap. Bp. Taylor*, p. 69. The Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore the whole of Christ, verily and indeed present, and verily combined with the Sacramental signs, but in a mystical, heavenly, and spiritual manner, *Bp. Overall*, p. 42, 3 truly, and substantially, and essentially, *Laurence*, (*ap. Prynne*,) p 58. truly, *Bp. Bilson*, (quoted by *Bps Montagu*, p. 36. *and White*, p. 57.) *Abp. Laud*, p.

58, 9. truly, really, and substantially, *Bp. Forbes*, p. 59. actually, *Johnson*, p. 79. Presence real and substantial, *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. mysterious yet real, *L'Estrange*, p. 67. real, *Bp. of Exeter*, p. 86, 7. add *Bp. Fell*, p. 66. *Brett*, p. 82. at the Altar, *Abp. Laud*, p. 57. *Pocklington*, (*ap. Prynne*,) p. 72. *Bp. Ken*, p. 58. Distance of His Body in place no objection to this, *Sutton*, p. 54. *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. *Bp. Ken*, p. 72. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71.

By the word Amen, the Communicant professes his belief in the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, *Bp. Sparrow*, p. 65. *Comber*, p. 76. (comp. *Johnson*, p. 80. *Bp. Taylor*, Worthy Communicant, iv. 7. vol. xv. 670.)

Present to all that worthily receive, *Abp. Sharp*, p. 81 To the unworthy also, *Jackson*, p 52.

Under the forms or species of bread and wine, *Sutton*, p. 57. *Grabe*, p. 86. Unworthy receiving defiles the Body and Blood of Christ, *Mede*, (from *S. Chrys.*) p. 61, 2.

Real Presence confessed generally, *Bps. Ridley, &c.* (See above head "Churches of England," &c.) our Saviour comes and offers to us His own Body and Blood, *Bp. Beveridge*, p. 74. *Comber*, p. 76. true, real, Presence denied by no genuine son of the Church of England, *Abp. Bramhall*, p. 62, 3. (quoted by *Bp of Exeter*, p. 86) true and real, taught by the Church of England. *Abp. Laud*, p. 57. *Wheatley*, p. 85.

That Presence caused by the Consecration, not by our Faith, *Bp. Cosin*, p. 64. *Thorndike*, p. 67. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 69. *Bp. Bull*, p. 75 *Hickes*, p. 76.

Not in receiving only, *Bp. Overall*, p. 42. *Herbert*, p. 62.

Our Lord's words consecrated for ever the elements of bread and wine, *Hooker*, p. 36. He Himself consecrates now, *Bp. Sparrow*, p. 65. Our Lord's words joined to the element make the Sacrament, *Bp. Andrewes*, p 45. The elements changed supernaturally, *Dr. Donne*, p. 50. Sacramentally, but with such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that Omnipotency of Christ's word, *Bp. Ridley*, p. 35. Christ makes the elements His Body and Blood, *Bp. Sparrow*, p. 65. *Brett*, p. 83. the symbols changed Sacramentally into the Body and Blood of Christ, *Bp. Taylor*, p. 69. are Sacramentally His Body and Blood, *Jackson*, p. 51. *Thorndike*, p. 66. *Comber*, p. 77. in that Sacramental sense in which He spake the words, *Bp. Beveridge*, p. 74. become the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, *Bp Bull*, 75. *Wheatley*, p 85. without change of substance, *Johnson*, p. 79. the mysterious Body and Blood of Christ, *Id. ib.* The Bread in the Holy Sacrament is the Body of Christ, *Leslie*, p. 81. The Bread on which the thanks are given is the Body of Christ in the remembrance of Him, *Bp. Ridley*, p. 35. The Body and Blood of Christ are made present by Consecration, *Abp. Bramhall*, p. 64. Prayer "that the Holy Spirit may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ," *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71. *Bp. Wilson*, p. 85. (comp. *Thorndike*, p. 66. *Bull*, p. 75.) (See also *Bp. Andrewes*, above, head, "Our Lord's words 'This is My Body,'") that Bread hath more in it than the substance which our eyes behold, *Hooker*, p. 40. the consecrated elements His Body and Blood to us, *Id. ib.* The Power of the Ministry of God, bringeth God Himself from heaven; by blessing visible elements maketh them invisible graces, *Id. ib.* hath to dispose of that Flesh which was given for the life of the

world, and that Blood which was poured out to redeem souls, *Id. ib.* Christ hath imparted power to it over that mystical body, which is the society of souls, and over that natural, which is Himself, *Id. ib.*

The Bread, though not transubstantiated, to be called His Body. *Dr. Donne*, p. 49. The elements receive a new form, a new essence, a new nature. *Id.* p. 50. After Consecration, not called Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ. *Bp. Overall*, p. 41.

The Christian Ministry handle (attrectation) the Body and Blood of Christ. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 72. We handle the mystical Body of Christ as Joseph, Nicodemus, Mary Magdalene, (His Holy Body on earth,) *Mede*, p. 62. Christ broken in the Holy Eucharist. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71. (comp. *Herbert*, p. 62. *Bp. Hackett*, p. 73.) We there dip our tongues in the wounds of our Redeemer, are dyed red within and without, *Hooker*, p. 39. that Bread, with touching sanctifieth. *Id.* p. 40. Our Lord teaches, that He is to be touched truly now, though not carnally, *Bp. Andrewes*, p 48, 9. The old serpent, seeing the Blood of the true Paschal Lamb upon the lips of communicants, trembles to approach them.—ap. *Bp. Wilson*, p. 85. We have the price of our redemption in our hands. *Johnson*, p. 79.

Greatness of the Gift in the Holy Eucharist, chiefly in reference to the Incarnation.

The Holy Communion, the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death;—a deifical communion;—the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection;—the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life, (sayings of "Ancient Catholic Fathers," in *Homilies*, Sermon title page reverse.) A Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ in a marvellous *incorporation*, which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful *Homilies*, p. 33. The Holy Eucharist applies to individuals the benefit of the Incarnation. *Hooker*. p. 3. p. 14. n. p. and p. 37. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 44, 5. *Mede*, p. 61. (The Holy Spirit doth not unite us immediately to Himself, but to Christ's Human Nature, *Jackson*, p. 50.) We participate of that Flesh which Christ took of us. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 44, 5. Of the Word made Flesh. *Id.* p. 44. We take His Flesh as He ours. *Id. ib.* receive that Body and that Blood which for our sakes was dissolved, suffered for our sins, was raised again. *Id.* p. 47. The Bread which we break, the partaking of that Body and Flesh which Christ took. *Id.* p. 44. Of His true Body. *Id.* p. 49. There is the Blood which shall purge our consciences from dead works. *Id.* p. 45. life in it, by eating the Flesh of Christ. *Id.* p. 46. participate with the Flesh and Blood of Christ, as by nature we do by participating the flesh and blood, the substance of Adam. *Id.* p. 46. Christ united with us as being our nourishment, closer than any other union. *Id.* p. 44, 5 receive Christ Himself to be in us *Id.* p. 47. Never so truly in Christ and He in us, as when new from it. *Ib.* p. 46. By the Holy Eucharist we become partakers of the Divine nature. *Id.* p. 44. (*Comber*, p. 77.) Have the price of our redemption within us. p. 46. lay up our hope literally within our bosoms, *ibid.* By receiving His Blessed Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, we become the temples of His Body; the temple of His Body is in the temples of ours. *Id* p. 47. Christ dwelleth in us, by His Flesh in us. *Id. ib.* imparteth His whole entire Person as a mystical head. *Hooker*,

p. 38. Christ's Flesh mixed with ours through the Holy Eucharist, *Id.* Serm. p. 11, n. p. our bodies receive from His Flesh that life which shall make them glorious, *Id. ib.* His Body *in ours* a cause of immortality, ours joined with His which is incorruptible. *Id. ib.* The Holy Mysteries, duly received, instrumentally make us partakers of the grace of that Body and Blood, which were given for the life of the world, and impart to us in true, real, and mystical manner the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire. *Id.* p. 38. A mystical incarnation of Christ into every one who receives it. *Mede*, p. 60. We become Him. *Id. ib* It makes His Body ours; that Body which did once suffer death for us. *Comber*, p. 77. The Body of Christ becomes our body, and His Blood our blood, and we in a mystical manner flesh of His Flesh, and bone of His Bone. *Mede*, p. 60. Become members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bone. *Comber*, p. 78. The breaking, taking, eating of the Bread is the real communication of the Body of Christ, the very giving of His Body, to the communicant. *Hammond*, p. 65. The Son of God becomes our food. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71. (see *Bp. Andrewes*, above.) *Comber*, p. 78. The feast is God. *Herbert*, p. 62. We receive all Christ, and His Passion, and His graces. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 70. Christ crucified, broken, His Flesh bleeding, *Bp. Hackett*, p. 73. The Holy Eucharist, the means of the resurrection of our bodies. *Homilies*, p. 33. *Bp. Overall*, p. 42. *Bp. Andrewes*, p. 48. *Hooker*, p. 11. note p. *Comber*, p. 78. *Bp. Taylor*, p. 71. *Brett*, p. 83.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY JOHN HENRY PARKER, OXFORD.

A LIBRARY OF FATHERS

OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,

ANTERIOR TO THE DIVISION OF THE EAST AND WEST.

TRANSLATED BY MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.
REV. JOHN H. NEWMAN, B.D. REV. C. MARRIOTT, M.A.

VOLUMES PUBLISHED.

1. THE CONFESSIONS OF S. AUGUSTINE.
2. THE CATECHETICAL LECTURES OF S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.
3. S. CYPRIAN'S TREATISES.

4 & 5. S. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES ON 1 CORINTHIANS.

6. S. CHRYSOSTOM on GALATIANS and EPHESIANS.
7. S. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES ON ROMANS.
8. S. ATHANASIUS' TREATISES against ARIANISM, Pt. I.
9. S. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES ON THE STATUES, OR TO THE PEOPLE OF ANTIOCH.
10. TERTULLIAN. Vol. I.
11. S. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES on St. MATTHEW, Pt. I.
12. S. CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES on TIMOTHY, TITUS AND PHILEMON.

A COMMENTARY ON THE FOUR GOSPELS,

COLLECTED OUT OF THE

WORKS OF THE FATHERS;

TRANSLATED FROM THE

CATENA AUREA OF THOMAS AQUINAS,

EDITED BY THE REV.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D. J. KEBLE, M.A. J. H. NEWMAN, B.D.

VOL. I. ST. MATTHEW. 3 PARTS, £1 8s.
VOL. II. ST. MARK. 10s 6d.
VOL. III. ST. LUKE. Part I. 10s 6d.
VOL. IV. ST. JOHN. *in the press.*

Vol. II. 8vo. 10s 6d.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF M. L'ABBE FLEURY,

From the Second Ecumenical Council to the end of the Fourth Century.

TRANSLATED, WITH NOTES,

BY JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D. Fellow of Oriel College.

The portion of Fleury's History which it is proposed to publish at present will comprise the period between the Second Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople, A.D. 381. and the date of Pope Gregory the Great, about A.D. 600. It is calculated to form six volumes.

ENTIRE ABSOLUTION OF THE PENITENT:

A SERMON,

MOSTLY

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY,

IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, IN OXFORD,

On the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany, 1846.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

SIXTH THOUSAND.

SOLD BY JAMES PARKER & CO., OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

AND RIVINGTONS,

LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

1866.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PREFACE.

THE writer of the present Sermon has already stated, in the course of it, what was not, as well as what was, his object; yet it may possibly save some misunderstanding, here to restate it. Its object is, the relief of individual penitents. Consciences *are* burdened. There is a provision, on the part of God, in His Church, to relieve them. They wish to be, and to know that they are, in a state of grace. God has provided a means, however deeply any have fallen, to replace them in it. They feel that they cannot take off their own burden, loose the chains of their past sins, and set themselves free to serve God. They look for some act out of themselves, if there be one, which shall do this. God has provided it. They want something to sever between past and future, that they may begin anew. By His absolving sentence, God does efface the past. They cannot estimate their own repentance and faith. He has provided Physicians of the soul, to relieve and judge for those who "open their griefs" to them. They wish to know how to overcome besetting temptations; God has provided those, experienced in the sad history o_ man's sins and sorrows, who can tell them how others, through the grace of God, have overcome them.

Such are the cases to which the Church of which we are members, most directly applies the remedy of private Absolution, cases of heavy sin, or of timorous, scrupulous consciences; and this, either previous to the Holy Communion, or at the hour of death. There is a deep instinctive feeling, by which the soul (unless warped by human systems) does long to lay open any oppressive sin, before it comes into the presence of its Judge. Persons, who for a long period of life have carried about them the oppressive consciousness of some past, secret, sin, cannot bear it then; those who could not bring themselves to endure the pain and shame of confession in life, still often could not bear the thought of carrying their sin with them, unconfessed, into the very Presence of God. "They," says Hooker[a], "which during life and health, are never destitute of ways to delude repentance, do, notwithstanding, oftentimes, when their last hour draweth on, both feel that sting which before lay dead in them, and also thirst after such helps as have always till then been unsavoury." People have, through years of life, purposed to confess (if God enable them) at their death. But what instinctive reverence for Almighty God tells them should be done before death, should, if possible, be done in life. And so souls of the more earnest sort desire to undergo present pain, that they may obtain not forgiveness only, but enlarged grace and increased strength

[a] On "Private Confession and Absolution with us," bk. vi. 4. 15.

against evil, and so the fuller favour of Almighty God.

And this is obviously the more necessary, in sad cases of relapse, where the will is good but weak, and evil habits strong; and men break off a habit for awhile perhaps, and then are overtaken by it, and then perhaps despond, and give themselves up to it, or give up other good habits, as though all were lost.

And, in bad cases of relapse, a person cannot or ought not, without repentance proportionate, to go to the Holy Communion "with a quiet conscience." And so our Church, in her two exhortations, both warns us of the peril of "those who will presume to receive it unworthily," and if we are alarmed by her warnings, directs us how to find relief; which, doubtless, she intended also to encourage by the direction[b], that "those who intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate, at least some time the day before." "Because," says Hooker[c], "there are but few that consider how much that part of Divine service, which consisteth in partaking the holy Eucharist, doth import their souls; what they lose by neglect thereof, and what by devout practice they might attain unto; therefore, lest carelessness of general confession should, as commonly it doth, extinguish all remorse of men's particular enormous crimes, our custom (whensoever men present themselves at the Lord's

[b] Rubric at the beginning of the Communion Service.
[c] Loc. cit.

Table) is, solemnly to give them very fearful admonition, what woes are perpendicularly hanging over the heads of such as dare adventure to put forth their unworthy hands to those admirable mysteries of life, which have by rare examples been proved conduits of irremediable death to impenitent receivers; whom, therefore, as we repel being known, so being not known we terrify."

Again, let it be considered whether, among many blessed death-beds, which God has vouchsafed to us to see, this be not one chief ground of the complaint which earnest Parochial Clergy find occasion to make, that their ministrations to the dying poor are often seemingly unproductive, or that others come in, and, by a system of excitement, efface real repentance,—that the provision made by our Church is neglected. At that hour, people want, if it may be had, some special, present comfort, as belonging to themselves. The shadow of such comfort *is* furnished by those who *can* and do say, "Believe that you will be saved, and you will be saved." But the reality is furnished only by the Church, which says, "Repent, pour out thy griefs before God in presence of His Priest, and Christ will absolve thee, and wash thy soul in His own Blood." And this painful review of sins, as it implies real sincerity, so does it, by God's grace, tend much to increase repentance, and love, and trust in God.

But if we are to bring people to a very painful effort, we ought to offer them all to support them, which we are empowered. While warning against

delays of repentance, the Minister of Christ must, until the door is shut, both exhort to repentance and tell of its rewards, and encourage to it by the earnest of its acceptance. Who knows what, even in a brief space, God, Who needs no space, may work in a penitent's soul? "Because," Hooker says[d], "to countervail the fault of delay, there are in the latest repentance oftentimes the surest tokens of sincere dealing; therefore upon special confession made to the minister of God, he presently absolveth in this case the sick party from all his sins by that authority which Jesus Christ hath committed unto him, knowing that *God respecteth not so much what time is spent, as what truth is shewed in repentance.*"

Such were the cases which were chiefly before the writer's mind; cases, of which every one who has been called upon to minister to the sorrows of men's souls, knows that there are too many. Not the peace only, but the salvation of the soul, is now often in peril. For despondency is Satan's deadliest weapon, when men have deeply sinned; and he uses it too fatally to plunge men deeper in sin, or hold them fast in it, as thinking that recovery is hopeless.

Yet such are not the only cases to which the provisions of our Church directly apply. She explicitly contemplates another class, tender consciences, who need comfort, and peace, and re-assurance of the favour of their Heavenly Father. For (blessed be God!) there are those who feel the weight of any slight sin, more than others do "whole cart-loads;"

[d] vi. 4. 15.

and who do derive comfort and strength from the special application of the power of the keys to their own consciences. The words of our Church are very large; "a full trust in God's mercy and a quiet conscience," "if any by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort and counsel," "to the avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." What Minister of Christ, then, should take upon himself to drive away "His lambs," as if persons were to have less of the Ministry of comfort, the less they had offended God? As if any thing ought, in the estimation of the Christian Minister, to be of slight account, which disturbs the peaceful mirror of the soul, wherein it reflects God! The "benefit of Absolution," then, is intended by our Church, not only for the penitent, who are by it assured of God's acceptance of their repentance, and often by it replaced in a state of grace, but for all who can, through its ministry, approach with lightened, more peaceful hearts, to the Holy Communion. Our Church, in leaving her children free, did not mean to stint the use of the gifts entrusted to her, to force all consciences to one level; nor because she does not *require* Confession, therefore, (as some now would seem to interpret her,) by an opposite constraint to that which she laid aside, to *hinder* or withhold them from it. It was beautifully said in her first Liturgy[e],—"requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general Confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying,

[e] The Book of Common Prayer, &c., 1549.

the auricular and secret Confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church; but in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity; and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's Word to the same." And in later days, the principle of our Church was briefly characterized by a Bishop[f], belonging to an acknowledged English school. "It is confessed that private confession to a priest is of very ancient practice in the Church; of excellent use and practice, being discreetly handled. *We refuse it to none, if men require it, if need be to have it.* We urge it, and persuade it in extremes. We urge it in case of perplexity, for the quieting of men disturbed in their consciences."

Such, then, are the cases contemplated by our Church, the restoration of penitents, the relief of the conscience, either in sickness or before the Holy Communion, from the weight of grievous sin; the quieting of perplexed minds.

But, as was said, she restricted it not to the cases in which she recommended it. She did not, therefore, discourage it, when she ceased to urge it. We must believe that she who encouraged it in these

[f] Bp. Montague, quoted by Wordsworth, p. 77.

cases, would have recommended it in any other, if the need had then arisen, when she was free to recommend any thing.

Such a deep need, then, has arisen in the case of our youth. The "world" has ever thought, and will think, that, because children are little, the sins of children are of slight account. Not so conscience and experience, or the Word of God. Every one who has been called upon to minister in this way to human souls, knows too well, how years of sin and misery have mostly had their starting-point in some sin of the child. Even amid the deepest wounds of later life, one, perhaps the first grave offence of the child, lives ineffaceably in the memory of the penitent. Years of forgetfulness of self and of God have not been able to blot it out from the memory. As the freshness of early innocence, when the child, yet new from its Maker's Hands, was also newly washed from original guilt, is a bright, glad spot, over which the soul ever after yearns with a sacred unutterable longing, so that first breath of graver sin, which tainted that new paradise, leaves a painful memory of its own, single in the soul's history. It may seem strange, that after deep, heathenish, sins, that one, in itself so much lighter sin, should stand out so vividly in the memory. But the fact may be of great moral value. It is not an exaggeration, since it recurs again and again, and seems stamped by the Hand of God upon the conscience. It is His witness that childhood is a very sacred age. How should it not be, when He chose

it as a type of His disciples, and pronounced such a heavy woe on any one who made "one of these little ones to stumble?" But it is more. It is a witness how fearful, beyond all thought, sin is, when the first grave sin, by which the soul rebelled against God, wounds the soul so deeply; for deep must be the wound which after-years do not efface. Even when the soul has been covered over and over with sores, it has still felt, with a special pain, the wound of that first childish sin.

But more. The young need to be warned, not only against sin which they know, but against sin which they scarcely suspect to be sin. It will not be thought, that such strong language as has been used in this Sermon [g], was used lightly in the House of God, in His immediate Presence, and as by His Minister. It was founded on extensive, painful, knowledge. People speak commonly of the evils of Confession, as likely, or in some cases actually having conveyed to the soul, knowledge of evil. And it is painfully true that, in unskilful hands, in other countries, conducted in a dry technical way, it has [h]. But they forget that there are those around youth by whom they are more likely to be taught evil, than by the Priest; there is one nearer still to the soul, whose unceasing object it is, not to guard against it, but to instil and suggest it. Evil is mostly diligent in propagating

[g] p. 47 and 48.

[h] It is admitted with sorrow and indignation in Manuals, which warn earnestly against carelessness so terrible, as Bailly, t. iv. p. 257, sqq. ed. 6.

itself; one evil companion does often a world of evil; the good are tacitly a burthen to the bad, so the bad instinctively seek to make others like themselves. It is a great trial not to be ashamed of ignorance, even of evil. "Amongst my equals," says S. Augustine[i] of his heathen youth, "I was ashamed of a less shamelessness." Be the physician removed, lest he inadvertently poison his patients, if there be no risk, that the poison, introduced from other sources, shall work more secretly and more fatally! But again this is not the fear to which *our* nation is exposed; it can be avoided by ordinary caution and cleanness of heart. Purity of soul is guarded by Him Who gives it; it is not easily injured even by one unskilful; where it exists, it carries its own evidence; it is not blighted by all the foulness of the world, much less will it be by the Priests of God.

But be it (as people think) a choice of evils, as there must be evil, wherever there is human infirmity and ignorance, and this there must be in things ministered by man. And yet let people bring before themselves, that it is a choice of evil; that all evil and peril does not lie on the side of sacred intercourse with God's Priests[k]; that the world and

[i] Conf. ii. 7 and 17.

[k] As much has been said of late very offensively on this subject, it may be mentioned that, in the "Manuel des Confesseurs," there are given, from the "Prêtre Sanctifié," special cautions as to "les interrogations sur la pureté avec les enfans, avec les adultes et les personnes mariées." (p. 157, 158.) It is advised to risk incomplete confession, rather than risk conveying

Satan are busy, and with dreadful success; and then let them weigh which is safest,—to leave the soul open to the inroads of the world and Satan, or to guard it, even though "he who is to watch for the soul" be liable to occasional error. The writer is almost ashamed to say so much; but the deep suspicion fostered unhappily in the English mind, by which their holiest earthly affections are enlisted against the very remedy for sore existing evil, made it a duty to speak plainly, and to make one strong protest against it. Let this be said; they who, through ministering to such as after sin have again been brought back to God, have known their whole sorrowful history, have had no doubt, that, humanly speaking, in most cases, *early confession would, by the blessing of Almighty God, have saved them from their sin and misery;* and then let men think whether it be not possible, that this suspicion of confession may be sowed by the father of lies himself, in order to keep his own kingdom undisturbed, and carry on his ravages in the soul unhindered.

We do not disuse medicines for the body because poisons have been administered through carelessness,

knowledge of evil to one ignorant of it. Again, there and elsewhere, special warning is given not to mention the circumstances of any such sins. S. Charles Borromeo gives cautions to the same effect, ib. p. 196. The "Manuel" is the work chiefly used in France; the "Prêtre Sanctifié" has been sanctioned at Rome also. Bailly (probably, in the passage lately referred to, to prove the contrary) gives most earnest admonitions as to caution "ne juniores ea doceantur quæ feliciter ignorabant."—T. iv. p. 257. ed. 6.

or disorders wholly mistaken, and so treated as to bring death, not life, or even the infection of mortal diseases been unsuspectingly conveyed; nor do men cease to take advice as to their estates, because ignorant or dishonest lawyers have at times ruined their clients. People are content to run risks in one case, because they value their lives or estates: they magnify the risks in the other, because they either value not their souls, or dislike the cure, or think they cannot be lost. "One we must have," says Bp. Andrewes[1], "to know thoroughly the state of our lands or goods; one we must have, entirely acquainted with the state of our body: in our souls it holdeth not! I say no more; it were good it did!"

In every thing else, men appeal to experience as the very test of truth; which, then, will they not believe,—that men have been wounded? but themselves confess it; or that they are now healed? but their lives show it; or that this was not the means of their healing? how, then, is it, that up to this time they were sick, ever sinking back into the same sins, and now are whole? This is said, of course, simply as a reason why people should not *à priori* speak against truth which they know not, not as the ground of that truth. Such facts bring the truth home to us individually, as acts of the Providence, or Justice, or Love of Almighty God impress more deeply upon our souls the truths of nature or of grace which we before believed. The ground for

[1] Serm. iv. on Whitsunday, ad fin. quoted by Wordsworth, p. 73, 74.

belief that "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power with His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him," is His own words, which the Church hath ever understood, as He, in their plain meaning, spake them.

But in all this, nothing has been implied with regard to the *authoritative* restoration of any system of confession. In the abstract, indeed, "with us," as Hooker [m] says, "the Church is not denied to have authority either of abridging or *enlarging* the use and exercise of that power." It is a matter of discipline, open to the Church, to enforce public penance, as in the Ancient Church, or private confession, as now in the Roman Church; or to leave the exercise of it to the consciences of individuals. But no amount of *voluntary* confession involves the restoration of *compulsory;* the one is the prompting of the conscience within, the other the provision of discipline without. And all the indications of God's Providence, for some time past, point to the great restoration of inward life in this portion of His Church, as the inward operation of God the Holy Ghost, not to be promoted by any outward laws or discipline. We need no *organic* change in the Church, no Convocation, no laws, no enforcement of outward directions, no public discipline. It were to begin at the wrong end. What we need is, that men's hearts should be restored, the longings after a more inward, or more watchful, more devoted life, fostered, the desire of greater strictness with self, and conformity to the

[m] See p. 11, note.

Will of God strengthened, the indistinct feeling after a higher standard of duty confirmed and more defined. The duty of the present day is not to forestall, or calculate, or plan, for the future; but to do that for the present needs, which God gives to be done. Our duties lie severally to individuals, of whom God assigns the charge to any; as a whole, we need to follow, not to guide; for That which we should follow is the only sure Guide, the deep Working of the Holy Spirit, which is anew more fully penetrating our whole Church, and lifting it up, as a whole, as the Ark upon the waters.

What then was said in this sermon as to the duties of the Clergy[n], had reference, not to the introduction of any new system, but to this point only, how existing needs of the laity might be met. As was stated in the sermon itself, the exercise of private Confession and Absolution has arisen, not in the recommendations of the Clergy, but in the needs both of the Clergy and laity. And these needs must increase, as, with deepening earnestness, the consciousness of past heavy sin becomes more burthensome, or persons become more alive to the evil of all sin, and look out for every aid which may, by God's help, be a check upon it, or, through the Blood of Christ, may cleanse from it.

It is then an entire perversion of the whole ques-

[n] Many of the Congregation, for whom University Sermons are intended, necessarily being Clergymen, it has never been thought beyond a Preacher's province to speak of our common duties.

tion, that some have ventured to speak of "priestly power," "spiritual independence," "sacerdotal rights," &c. If a physician goes about to minister to the sick, bind up the broken, apply to the cure of diseases the medicines which God has given him the knowledge and the skill to use, no one speaks of "assumption of power;" no one thinks it a part of "independence" to die neglected. Why then speak of "priestly power," when people ask the Ministers of God to impart that with which God has entrusted them? Why is it undue "power" to bind up the broken-hearted, to pour into their wounds the wine and oil of penitence, to lift them up when desponding, to loose them, in Christ's Name, from the chains of their sins, and encourage them anew to the conflict? Why but that to those who know not what the conflict is, what sin is, who have no idea of mental sickness, or anxiety or distress, all, both sickness and remedy, must seem a dream? To minister to bodily wants is accounted a benefit; to minister to spiritual, which men know not of, is a reproach. In the world, "they that exercise lordship over them are called benefactors;" but even an Apostle had occasion to say, "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?"

Yet one would fain hope, that some who do so speak, do not mean this. It cannot surely be meant, that if religious parents taught their children to confess their faults to themselves, and then, at a somewhat riper age, transferred them to a minister of

God, to open their hearts to him[o]; or if they, who are burthened with the memory of past, heavy sin, and cannot get free from it, long to pour it out before God in the presence of His Priest, and receive through him the sentence of God's forgiveness; or if people find that to take shame is a healthful medicine, or that confession is a quieting of the conscience, a check to the inferior will, that they fall not again and again into the same faults; or that it keeps the heart clean, and that God thereby imparts new energy to serve Him,—it cannot be meant that willingness to minister to such cases is an assumption of priestly power, or that to recommend in specific cases a known remedy, is to interfere between the soul and God. Who shall venture to call that "Priestcraft" which is the channel of God's grace to the soul?

Let those who are whole (God grant that they be found such in the Day of Judgment!) dispense with a Physician; let any who find it suffice to them to bring their sicknesses before the Heavenly Physician, accept their healing thankfully from His Hand, the Good Samaritan; they who do this habitually and earnestly, will be the last to blame those who seek in any lawful way to have the diseases of their souls healed. But let not men declaim against remedies which they have not tried, nor seek to deter the

[o] The pious Chancellor Gerson (A. D. 1400) in his "De Parvulis ad Christum trahendis," with large experience, speaks of the great peril of early corruption, and of confession as "directrix efficacissima ad Christum."

wounded of Christ's flock from being bound up, lest they draw down upon themselves that woe, "Ye neither enter in yourselves, and those who would have entered in, you hinder." "For thus saith the Lord God, Behold I, even I, will both search My sheep and seek them out: I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick; but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment[p]."

It now remains only to state, that parts of the Sermon were omitted in the delivery, since it seemed likely, even thus, to reach the full limit of University Sermons. These parts have been inclosed within brackets, except that, where the omissions consisted of half sentences, in which no doctrine was contained, or the omission of texts of Scripture, it would have been simply pedantic to mark them.

One word only of caution may be added to the young, into whose hands this Sermon may fall, with regard to the passages on Mortification in pp. 62, 64, which were the rather omitted in the delivery, lest, without explanation, any should act upon them indiscreetly. It is part of the humility of penitence to feel one's self unable to guide one's self. For there is much risk[q], lest, in the first fervour of peni-

[p] Ezek. xxxiv. 11. 16.

[q] See Mr. Newman's valuable Sermon, "Dangers to the Penitent," in the "Sermons on the Subjects of the Day."

tence, a person should bind himself with rigid rules, disproportioned to his weakness, which might injure body or mind; or entangle himself with indefinite, or too minute, or unbending rules, which, under altered circumstances, or in time, might become unfitting or a snare to the conscience; and then a person grows weary, or desponds, or loses the cheerfulness of his penitence and goes on as a slave, or relaxes unduly and falls into carelessness, or is beset by scruples, and tossed hither and thither, instead of keeping, by the grace of God, a steady, onward course. If a person must guide himself, it is better to take some gentle rule at first, involving moral discipline and restraint, correcting some wrong temper or self-will, or to make the fasts of the Church penitential, rather than to add bodily discipline, of his own mind. But it is better, of course, not to be one's own physician, when the mind which would have to prescribe for its own healing, is itself the sick part of us. And God in His mercy has given us, everywhere, those who have learnt of Him how "to lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, and make straight paths for the feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way, but that it rather be healed."

May He Who has begun a good work in us, perform it unto the Day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Christ Church,
Septuagesima, 1846.

A

SERMON,

&c.

St. John xx. 21—23.

"*Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you. As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*"

It will be in the memory of some that when, nearly three years past, Almighty God (for "secret faults," which He knoweth, and from which, I trust, He willed thereby the rather to "cleanse" me,) allowed me to be deprived for a time of this my office among you, I was endeavouring to mitigate the stern doctrine of the heavy character of a Christian's sins, by pointing out the mercies of God which might reassure the penitent the means of his restoration, the earnests of his pardon. And in so doing, it seemed best, first to dwell upon the unfathomable mercies of God in Christ, the exhaustless abyss of mercy in the Infinite Fountain of Mercy;—when it is not finally shut out, Infinite as Himself, as being poured out from His Infinity; and then more directly on all those

untold and ineffable mercies contained in the Intercession of our Lord, at the Right Hand of God, for us. For so, I hoped, would the hearts of penitents be the more fixed upon Him, the source of all mercies, and their faith be strengthened, and they the more hope that no depth of *past* sin could utterly sever them from the love of Christ; nay, could sever them from no degree or fulness of His unspeakable love. For what limit shall there be to His tender mercy, Who devised that wondrous scheme of man's redemption, and gave His Only-Begotten, Co-equal, Son, that man, the work of His Hands, should not perish? What bounds to the compass of His love, Who, being Eternal God, so compassionated us as to take our nature upon Him, that He might die for us; and not die only, "but live to make intercession for us?" What bounds to His power to restore, Who hath "all power in heaven and in earth," and as yet exerciseth that power to restore us? What an infinite depth must there be in that love, which joined our lowliness to His Majesty, took our misery, to impart to us His Mercy, His Love, and His Joy! And so I hoped that both they, who, educated in imperfect systems, suspect all who speak of the channels of Divine Mercy, as though they forgot Him, Its Everflowing Source, might be less indisposed to the truth; and that they who received the truth, might have their souls the more fixed upon Him, Who is the Truth, and by Whom to us is all grace and truth. And when, further, I began to speak of the means by which God applies that grace, I wished to dwell upon those sacred Gifts by which He vouchsafes to impart it *to* us, before I spoke of those acts of our

own, yet equally His Gifts *in* us, by which He worketh it *in* us; that so we might the more have it impressed upon us, that all is of Him. And of these Gifts, I spoke first of the Holy Eucharist, rather than of the special application of the power of the keys, because I hoped that on that great Gift, whereof we all habitually partake, we might be the rather one; and not dispute (as I never meant to speak controversially) upon the Gifts Which He left as "the pledges of His love;" whereas, since the special use of the power of the keys was, in the last unhappy century, so much laid aside, and has been but partially resumed, and the very language of our Divines or the Reformers is so unfamiliar at least to men's minds and sympathies, I could not but fear that it might to many seem an unaccustomed teaching, distinctly as it is owned by our Church. I dwelt then first on the comfort of the Holy Eucharist to the penitent, as a Sacrament and as a commemorative Sacrifice. As a Sacrament, because, in the words of our Liturgy, in It "our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood;" as a commemorative Sacrifice, I will simply rehearse to you some of the words of the Apostolic Bp. Wilson[a], who, in his

[a] Sunday Meditations, *before Service begins.* Add ibid. "We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this Bread and this Cup.

"We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies; beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ; and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain a remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.

untold and ineffable mercies contained in the Intercession of our Lord, at the Right Hand of God, for us. For so, I hoped, would the hearts of penitents be the more fixed upon Him, the source of all mercies, and their faith be strengthened, and they the more hope that no depth of *past* sin could utterly sever them from the love of Christ; nay, could sever them from no degree or fulness of His unspeakable love. For what limit shall there be to His tender mercy, Who devised that wondrous scheme of man's redemption, and gave His Only-Begotten, Co-equal, Son, that man, the work of His Hands, should not perish? What bounds to the compass of His love, Who, being Eternal God, so compassionated us as to take our nature upon Him, that He might die for us; and not die only, "but live to make intercession for us?" What bounds to His power to restore, Who hath "all power in heaven and in earth," and as yet exerciseth that power to restore us? What an infinite depth must there be in that love, which joined our lowliness to His Majesty, took our misery, to impart to us His Mercy, His Love, and His Joy! And so I hoped that both they, who, educated in imperfect systems, suspect all who speak of the channels of Divine Mercy, as though they forgot Him, Its Everflowing Source, might be less indisposed to the truth; and that they who received the truth, might have their souls the more fixed upon Him, Who is the Truth, and by Whom to us is all grace and truth. And when, further, I began to speak of the means by which God applies that grace, I wished to dwell upon those sacred Gifts by which He vouchsafes to impart it *to* us, before I spoke of those acts of our

own, yet equally His Gifts *in* us, by which He worketh it *in* us; that so we might the more have it impressed upon us, that all is of Him. And of these Gifts, I spoke first of the Holy Eucharist, rather than of the special application of the power of the keys, because I hoped that on that great Gift, whereof we all habitually partake, we might be the rather one; and not dispute (as I never meant to speak controversially) upon the Gifts Which He left as "the pledges of His love;" whereas, since the special use of the power of the keys was, in the last unhappy century, so much laid aside, and has been but partially resumed, and the very language of our Divines or the Reformers is so unfamiliar at least to men's minds and sympathies, I could not but fear that it might to many seem an unaccustomed teaching, distinctly as it is owned by our Church. I dwelt then first on the comfort of the Holy Eucharist to the penitent, as a Sacrament and as a commemorative Sacrifice. As a Sacrament, because, in the words of our Liturgy, in It "our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood;" as a commemorative Sacrifice, I will simply rehearse to you some of the words of the Apostolic Bp. Wilson[a], who, in his

[a] Sunday Meditations, *before Service begins.* Add ibid. "We offer unto Thee, our King and our God, this Bread and this Cup.

"We give Thee thanks for these and for all Thy mercies; beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this Sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ; and that all we, who are partakers thereof, may thereby obtain a remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.

Sacra Privata, thus prays: "May it please Thee, O God, Who hast called us to this ministry, to make us worthy to offer unto Thee this Sacrifice for our own sins and for the sins of Thy people."

And now, brethren, I would proceed to speak of that great authoritative act, whereby God in the Church still forgives the sins of the penitent. For all forgiveness of sin, as every gift of mercy or of grace, by whomsoever or howsoever it comes to us, is from Him. [He Who said, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Himself baptizeth invisibly whom the Church visibly baptizeth in His Name. He Who said, "It is not ye who speak, but the Spirit of your Father Who speaketh in you," Himself, as He promised, calleth, converteth, exhorteth, teacheth, guideth, through those

"May I atone[1] Thee, by offering to Thee, O God, by offering to Thee the pure and unbloody Sacrifice, which Thou hast ordained by Jesus Christ. Amen."

And ibid. Wed. Medit. LENT. Meditations proper for a Clergyman. "Give me such holy dispositions of soul whenever I approach Thine Altar, as may in some measure be proportionable to the holiness of the work I am about, of presenting the prayers of the faithful, of offering a spiritual Sacrifice to God, in order to convey the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ—the true Bread of Life—to all His members. Give me, when I commemorate the same Sacrifice that Jesus Christ once offered, give me the same intentions that He had, to satisfy the justice of God, to acknowledge His mercies, and to pay all that debt which a creature owes to his Creator. None can do this effectually but Jesus Christ: Him, therefore, we present to God in this Holy Sacrament."

---

[1] Ed. 2. fol. 1782. Other Edd. have "atone unto Thee." The above is probably correct; "atone" being so used for to "appease."

to whom He has given commission to do any office in His Name. He Who said, "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, speak to the heart of Jerusalem, and say to her, her sin is pardoned," Himself is, through them, The Only Comforter. He Who said, "Do this in remembrance of Me," Himself, by His Word of Power, invisibly consecrates and sends down His Spirit. He Who said, "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them;" and Who, as our Church says in her most solemn Absolution, "hath left power with His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and turn to Him," Himself looseth the bands of sins which He commandeth His servants who stand by to unloose in His Name; Himself absolveth in heaven those who according to His Will, are absolved on earth. In all things [b]], the Church or her Ministers are not instead of, but the instruments of, Christ. [Even as the eyes, the hands, the feet, act not instead of the soul, which informeth the whole body and acteth through every portion and member of it, so the "goodly feet of those who preach the Gospel of peace," or the "hands," which are "laid on" in the Name of Christ, or the Voice, which in Baptism pronounces the Name of the Holy Trinity upon us, or in Absolution saith, "By His Authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins," in the Name of the Same Holy Trinity, avail, not of themselves, but as the members, the feet, the hands, the voice of Christ. And as Almighty God chose some created form, in which to appear to man, and what was seen by the

[b] In preaching, this was abridged thus: "Baptizing, Absolving, Teaching, Consecrating, the Church," &c.

Patriarchs, was a created appearance, yet He was seen in the flame of fire in the bush, and heard on Mount Sinai; and again, "descended in a bodily shape like a dove," and a voice was heard, "This is My Beloved Son;" and still man "hath neither heard His voice nor seen His shape;"—so in all which is performed according to His Will, He it is, Who, "distributing to every man severally as He wills," worketh, through each member of His Mystical body and His visible instruments, that which He commandeth to be done in His own Name.] "God Alone," says S. Pacian[c], "can forgive sin. True! But that also which He doth through His priests, is His own power." "The Novatians," says S. Ambrose[d], "say that they show reverence to the Lord, reserving to Him Alone the power of forgiving sins. But indeed none do Him greater wrong, than they who would rescind His commands, and cast back upon Himself the office He committed to them. For since the Lord Jesus Himself said in His Gospel, 'Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained,' who honours Him most, he who obeyeth His commands or he who resisteth? The Church in both observeth obedience, both in binding and loosing sin." ["Why," he says again[e], "baptize ye, if sins may not be remitted through man? For in Baptism is the remission of all sins. Where is the difference, whether through penitence or through the laver the priests exert this power

[c] Ep. 1, ad Sympr. § 11, p. 325, O. T. add S. Firmilian, ap. S. Cyprian, Ep. 75, § 4, p. 271.

[d] De Pœnit. i. 2.

[e] Ib. i. 8, § 37, 38.

given to them? One is the mystery in both. But thou sayest, that in the laver the grace of the mysteries worketh. What in penitence? Worketh not the Name of God?" And again[f], on those solemn words, "It is impossible to renew them," "God is able, when He willeth, to forgive us sins, even those which we think cannot be forgiven. And, therefore, what to us seemeth impossible to be obtained, to God it is possible to grant.—It seemed impossible that water should wash away sin, or that sins should be forgiven through penitence; Christ granted this to His Apostles, which from the Apostles was transmitted to the offices of the priests; that, therefore, was rendered possible which seemed impossible." Once more[g]: "It cannot be doubted that the Spirit forgiveth sins, since the Lord Himself saith, 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, they shall be remitted.' See how sins are forgiven by the Holy Ghost. But to the remission of sins, men supply their ministry, yet do not exercise the right of any power; for they do not forgive sins in their own, but in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. They pray, God giveth; the execution is through man, the richness of the gift is from the Power on High." And Origen[h] on the same point: "He on whom Jesus hath breathed[i], forgiveth whom God would

[f] De Pœnit. ii. 2.

[g] De Sp. S. iii. 18, § 137.

[h] De Orat. c. xxviii.

[i] Origen adds here: ("As the Apostles, and they who may be known from the fruits as having received the Holy Spirit, and become spiritual by being led by the Spirit, after the manner of a son of God, to do each several thing according to the Word" or

forgive, and retaineth incurable sins, ministering unto God, Who Alone hath the power of forgiving, even as the prophets ministered unto God, in speaking not their own, but what was of the Divine Will." And S. Chrysostom[k]: "Whatsoever the priest hath entrusted to him is of God Alone to give—And why say I priests? Neither Angel nor Archangel can effect any thing as to the things given by God, but the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, dispenseth all; yet the priest lendeth his tongue and affordeth his hand." And in like manner S. Augustine[l].

And this efficacy, we, to whom God has given our lot in this portion of the Church, must in general believe; our own acts of devotion bear witness to us. For this was the express reason[m], why, in our

"Reason"). But, apparently, he only means by this restriction that such priests only as were spiritual persons would have the gift of "discerning of spirits;" and so, in their case, it might be the more hoped that their judgment would be the same as His Who "searcheth the heart." Shortly after, in answer to the difficulty, why the Apostles, having the power, do not remit all sins, he compares the "retaining" of "sins" under the Gospel to those cases under the law in which the priest was not to offer sacrifice; and adds, "So then the Apostles or the priests likened to the Apostles, after the pattern of the Great High-Priest, having received discernment as to the Service of God, know for what sins they ought to offer sacrifices, and when, and in what manner: and also for what they ought not so to do."

[k] In Johann. Hom. 86, fin.

[l]Ench. c. 83. "The Holy Spirit, in Whom Christ remitteth sins;" speaking of those who "believe not that sins are remitted in the Church." See at length below.

[m] This fact is stated on the authority of the late Bp. Lloyd, at the time when he was examining the origin of the several parts of our Liturgy. Dr. Bisse mentions the same ground, Sermon II., "Beauty of Holiness;" see at the end.

daily service, a solemn confession and Absolution precede the use of the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms, that so we might become fitter to use His Divine words, and to praise Him; we are directed to receive the Absolution kneeling, both at the daily service and at the Holy Communion, a humble posture, which we do not use at any mere exhortation or declaration or teaching; itself is entitled, "The absolution or remission of sins, to be *pronounced* by the priest alone" (for which, in a daughter-Church, "the *declaration*[n] of Absolution to be made by the priest alone," was substituted in compromising times). "Almighty God," it solemnly rehearseth, "hath given *power* and commandment" to His ministers, not "to declare" only, but "to pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins:" now "power" implies an authoritative act; and to "pronounce our pardon," if penitent, is a present act, not a mere abstract declaration, that God forgiveth the penitent[o]. Such is our least solemn form of Absolution. And it has been often observed, how, as the penitence may in

[n] American Common Prayer Book. The restriction to "the Priest alone" shows the intention to be the same.

[o] Wheatley (I have since seen) insists, with much force, on these and yet further points. 1. The Priest *stands up*, as with authority, and pronounces. 2. The title "THE *Absolution*," not "a *Declaration* of Absolution." 3. The word "Pronounce," signifying, as *Pronuntiare*, "to give sentence." 4. A Declaration, exciting to repentance, would rather have *preceded* the Confession. 5. The solemn preamble asserting the "power and commandment" given, followed by words which imply the exercise of that power. 6. "His people, *being* penitent;" but the penitent are the objects of Absolution, the impenitent of exhortation.

each case be supposed to be deeper, the Absolution by the Church becomes more authoritative and fuller; until, at last, in the private absolution, when the conscience most feels its burden, and has laid it down at the Feet of our Lord, she speaks, with the full consciousness of the authority, by Apostolic descent transmitted to her, words, which if not authorized, were blasphemy, "by His authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Nor can there be, in this, any question of freeing from the censures of the Church and of restoring to communion, from which among ourselves, none, except on individual responsibility, are in practice shut out, who do not shut out themselves. It is a private act between the sinner's soul and God, in the presence of His priest, the sinner seeking to have the burden of his sin relieved, the priest declaring, in the Name of the Holy Trinity, "by His Authority, committed unto me, I absolve thee." And to this, such among us as are parochial ministers, are bound to invite their people, to "open their grief," not in sickness only, but before the Holy Communion, if they cannot "quiet their own consciences," that they "may receive the benefit of Absolution;" and in visiting the sick, our Church directs those who will obey her, "to move the sick person to make a *special* confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter," not to wait for him, but ourselves to "move him thereto;" and then, "if he humbly and heartily desire it, thus to absolve him[p]." And "His Autho-

[p] Both of these provisions are omitted in the American Com-

rity" so to do, was, ye know, conveyed to us, in the very words[q], in which it was given by our Lord to the Apostles; so that whatever authority they conveyed to the Apostles, they do, thus far, convey to us also: "which although," says S. Pacian[r], "for our sins it be presumptuous to claim, yet God, who hath granted unto bishops the name of even His Only Beloved, will not deny it unto them."

[And while among us private Confession has been left to the consciences of individuals, the Church has both deepened the tone of the public Confession, and

mon Prayer Books. Both are insisted upon by Hooker, in a passage very remarkable for the thoughtfulness with which it is worded; especially in that he concedes that the Church *may* order this whole subject of private Confession and Absolution as she judges best, and regards the course taken by the Church of England as liable to revision by her—("The Church of England *hitherto* hath thought it the safer way," &c.) "And for private Confession and Absolution, it standeth thus with us. The minister's power to absolve is publicly taught and professed; the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power; upon the people no such necessity imposed of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible; neither any such opinion had of the thing itself, as though it were either unlawful or unprofitable, saving only for these inconveniences, which the world hath by experience observed in it heretofore. And in regard thereof, the Church of England hitherto hath thought it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves only: howbeit not without special caution for the admonition of such as come to the Holy Sacrament, and for the comfort of such as are ready to depart the world."—Eccl. Pol. bk. vi. 4. 15, where he enlarges on both.

[q] "Receive the Holy Ghost [for the Office and Work of a Priest now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands]. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," &c.—Office for the Ordering of Priests.

[r] Ep. i. § 13, p. 326.

made the public Absolution more solemn and more authoritative, in that where, in other Offices[s], there is a sort of mutual Absolution of the priest and people, in ours the Absolution is confined to "the priest alone."]

And all this doctrine of our Church as to Absolution is the more solemn, as not being a profession only in the sight of men, but embodied in acts in the Name of Almighty God Himself; in His daily worship; at the Holy Communion, or in earnest preparation for it; and when the soul is approaching for its last conflict, for that moment which sums up all the past and shall decide eternity. The sacred stillness at the Holy Communion, when, after the deep confession which our Church gives us, one voice alone is heard, and we, the rest, in silence receive it; the intense earnest longing, with which the penitent awaits those words of awful comfort, which the Church commissions her priests to pronounce, or the thrill of awe which any of us must ourselves have felt, when we sinners had to take on our lips her words, "by His Authority I absolve thee," and that in the Name of the All-Holy Trinity, may well make us think more deeply, how very solemn the doctrine is, which is so embodied.

There is a further, in some sense more awful and more painful, part of the doctrine of the keys, to which our Church also bears witness, the power not to loose only, but to bind; not to remit only, but to retain sin. She yearly expresses[t] her sorrow at the

[s] In the Breviary and Missal.

[t] Commination Service. It has been suggested to me to observe, how "the mode of expression in the Commination Service

loss of the "godly discipline," whereby "persons who stood convicted of notorious sin, were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the Day of the Lord;" and in her Articles (Art. xxxiii.) she speaks of such, as being "cut off from the unity of the Church," and to be counted "as heathen," "until they be openly reconciled by penance." But this whole subject of discipline does not belong to me. Nor need I speak of that power of "binding," which, equally with that of "loosing," is in our Church conferred on her priests in the Name of the Holy Trinity; since such a power is to be exercised only towards the impenitent: our office is chiefly with the penitent. The one object, as I have explained, of this series of sermons, is to minister to one class of souls, those whose consciences being oppressed by the memory of past sin, more or less grievous, long to know how they may be replaced in that condition, in which God once placed them; and now, too, my object is, not to speak of discipline in general, or what were best for the Church or for her members generally, but of that mercy which, by the power of the keys, God pours out upon the penitent.

This, then, is probably one ground, why so little needed to be said in the New Testament, as to the

implies, that the Absolution after Penance is *the* way of healing post-baptismal sin, and that we do without it for a time, only until we can bear our cure." And this falls in with the repeated and earnest attempts of Cranmer to bring in Church-discipline. See in Wordsworth's valuable collection, Appendix to a Sermon on Evangelical Repentance, p. 41, sqq. Parker, 1842.

forgiveness of sins of a Christian very grievously fallen, that our Lord had left a living provision in His Church, whereby all penitents, however fallen, should be restored. In healthful times, when discipline was observed, and people were in earnest about their souls, and felt the pressure of their sins, and the darkness of the absence of Divine grace, and a healthful fear of the wrath of God, there needed not proof that sins could be forgiven, because their forgiveness was seen, and witnessed, and felt, and shone forth in the renewed health and life of the soul. When the Church "with whom," in the language of a father[u], "there was one hope, one fear, one joy, one suffering, because there is One Spirit from One Lord and Father, grieved together" over the fall of "one of her members," "together laboured for its cure," and was gladdened by the holy conversation of restored penitents, and their victories in conflicts wherein they had before been vanquished, she knew that the gift of reconciliation was lodged in her, in which the whole body took part. Mourning with those who mourned, she knew the rather that they were comforted, whose restoration was furthered by her love and deep sighs and prayers. The discipline under which the penitent was brought and was humbled, was the very token of his restoration. He felt the power lodged in the Church to bind, and its very exercise assured him that he might be loosed. He saw those, once, with himself, oppressed by Satan, set free; and he knew that the inward bonds by which Satan held him, the cords of his sins and the iron chain of evil

[u] Tert. de Pœn. c. x. p. 366, O. T.

habits, might be loosed. The Church could give account of the source of her powers, to any who might be entitled to ask her, and could appeal to the commission given her by her Lord; the workings of that power were the pledge to individuals. When she, in her Lord's Name, said to the lame, "Arise, and walk," and to the leper, "Be cleansed," and to the blind, "Wash in the pool of Siloam, i.e. of Him Who is sent," and the palsy of past sin was healed, and men "ran the way of God's commandments," the leprosy and defilement of sin fell off, and "their flesh was turned to them like the flesh of a little child;" and they who had been dried up by the decrepitude of sin, became anew "like little children," "of whom is the kingdom of heaven;" and the blind through trespasses and sins, "saw everything clearly," and those whose very senses were defiled, could taste anew the sweetness of heavenly things, "and the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come;"—when through His gifts in the Church God wrought such spiritual miracles as these, no one needed to ask, "By what power or authority doest thou these things?" When by her healing she showed that she was clad with the power of her Lord, none needed to question whether she had the authority of her Lord Who by her healed. When the lame arose and walked, none after that asked Him, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?"

And if any ask her yet, when she had said to one crippled by sin, "In the Name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk,"—"By what power or by what name have ye done this?" her answer is still that of St. Peter, "His Name, through faith in His Name,

hath made this man strong; yea, the faith which is by Him, hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all[v]." His Name is it, through faith in His Name, which healeth, although pronounced by her at His bidding.

Thus the practice of the Church became the comment upon Holy Scripture, upon which that practice rested; as in other practice, the Apostolic rite of infant baptism pointed out a meaning of our Lord's words,—"Suffer little children to come unto Me,"—about which we might otherwise have doubted; or, in doctrine, the Creeds, which rest on Holy Scripture, teach to us meanings of the Divine Word and saving truths of faith, which, but for them, we should never have perceived. [The possession of the key at once opens to us what without it would have been hidden from us. And so, even in human documents, every one knows how difficult it is to define the meaning of what has been long in disuse; whereas of what we use, we most often, perhaps, forget the grounds of our usage, in the practice whereof we never doubted. So far from needing strict or full proof of any thing which through habitual belief or practice has become part of ourselves, proof is lost in knowledge, and intuitive perception displaces reasoning. We think not of title-deeds when we are in possession of our inheritance from above. We are even startled, or perhaps for a moment perplexed, by a question as to the ground of action, which, by practice, had to us become of the nature of an axiom, or is founded upon first principles; or of doctrine, which, from long belief, has been inwrought

[v] Acts iv. and iii. 16.

into our souls. And, contrariwise, in the absence of such practice, it must be expected that much will become again obscure, and minds will be driven backwards or forwards, not knowing how much of Holy Scripture to apply to their own case; sometimes speaking to themselves "peace when there is no peace;" or again, scarcely venturing to apply to themselves words of comfort and mercy which God intended for them. As, in other doctrine, when people leave the guidance of the Church, heresy, or what the ancient Church called "ungodly blasphemy," will seem to them the most natural, or the only meaning of Holy Scripture; while] to the believer, because he believes, the full truth of the Gospel sheds its light upon the whole of Holy Scripture, and is reflected and flashes forth from it. The Church proposes, faith receives, the Holy Ghost teaches. Scripture establishes, holy living roots it fast in us, devotion makes it part of ourselves; or rather the same Holy Spirit worketh all in us, teaching us, and making our hearts teachable; imparting to us the truth, in form in the Creeds, in substance in Holy Scripture, and opening our hearts to believe, and love, and worship, until through love and devotion we live in and on that faith as the breath of our spiritual life,—ever, as in our natural life, renewed and sustained by Him, ever unconsciously, anew received by us, yet never parted with, until, as part of ourselves, it passeth with us into that blessed world, where it melts into sight of Him Whom here, not seeing, it loved.

[Apart from the doctrine and practice of "the power of the keys," there would be difficulty as to

the case of very grievous sin of the Christian. "What is the amount of the restoration? how may he know that he is restored? Is his restoration complete? can he be restored after any degree of sin? can he have at once the full grace of Christ in the New Testament to keep him from falling; and, if he fall deeply, are all the evangelic promises of the Old Testament his also, when he has had them once, and has forfeited them?" For the study of the New Testament, could we imagine pursued apart from the light which we derive unconsciously from the instructions of the Church, might well affright the sinner. It speaks chiefly of holiness, as the path of the Christian; he is "full of sin." The Epistle, which most fully sets forth the doctrine of grace and the course of the Christian life, and its relation to the law, most speaks of "walking according to the Spirit," and of growth in holiness. "God," it says [w], "has set forth Christ Jesus to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins;" but of what sins?—"of the sins that are past," (*τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*), "in the forbearance of God," "in the times of ignorance at which God winked." "There is therefore," it [x] opens its description of the

[w] Rom. iii. 25.

[x] Ib. viii. 1. No one text is adduced out of the Epistle to the Romans on "sin after Baptism, by any expositor of Art. XVIII. (see Wordsworth, App. p. 1, 2.) Of the passages cited from the Epistles (see ibid.), Gal. vi. 1, S. James iii. 2, 1 John i. 8, 9; ii. 1, 2, relate primarily to sins of infirmity in the Christian; Eph. iv. 32, to past forgiveness; 1 Tim. i. 15, primarily to our first acceptance (as do Acts iii. 19; v. 31.). 2 Cor. ii. 6—8, and vii. 10 (as bearing upon it), directly refer to ministerial ab-

Christian life, "now no condemnation to those which are in Christ Jesus." But who are these? "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." The parables of our Lord, of the prodigal son, or the stray sheep[y], do, according to the manifold meaning of Holy Scripture which the Church warrants us in applying to our comfort, relate, in their full blessedness, to any restoration of the penitent. But until we find ourselves thus warranted, we might have

solution, and the dispositions needed for it; as do S. James v. 14—16, 20, to the ministerial office primarily; in 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit i. 13, censure implies restoration, but they are addressed to Bishops, as are the exhortations in Rev. ii. iii. (quoted by Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Pacian, &c., and they do bear *them* out, since the very question with the Novatians related to the Church's power to restore). Acts viii. 22, speaks at once of the possibility of restoration from such sins as that of Simon Magus, and its extreme difficulty (see S. Athanasius and others in Scripture Views of Holy Baptism, p. 235, n. 2). The strongest passages are perhaps 1 John v. 16, as stating that the "sin unto death" only was beyond the reach of ordinary intercession (and yet this very text is one which, apart from the teaching of the Church as to Absolution, most often harasses wounded consciences, lest theirs should be that very sin); and 2 Pet. iii. 9.

All this is not said to imply that such texts as 1 John i. 8, 9, ii. 1, 2, &c. are not to be taken in their largest acceptation and deepest comfort, as declaring God's forgiveness of *all* sin. The question is not as to their meaning, but as to the *evidence* of that meaning from the mere context of Holy Scripture, apart from the teaching of the Church, or to their application, independently of the means of restoration which God in her has provided for the penitent.

[y] Tertullian, as a Montanist, in arguing against the application of this text, found difficulty in the practice of the Church, which, by placing the figure of the Good Shepherd on her chalices, expressed her conviction that the assurance of mercy in the parable belongs to fellow-Christians also; see de Pudic. c. 7 and 10.

feared lest they belonged only to the first—the restoration of man in his fallen estate;—not if, when he had been restored to the fold or to his Father's house, he anew wandered. The promises of the Old Testament seem to belong, in the first instance, to the first coming of the Redeemer, and to describe the full forgiveness of those who receive Him; *they do not carry their own evidence*, that they belong to those who are fallen from grace, or, in the awful language of the New Testament, "have crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh, and counted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." And then, on the other hand, are the terrible warnings that such "it is impossible to renew unto repentance;" that "if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries," and our Lord's warning, "sin no more, lest a worse thing happen unto thee;" and Esau's lost birthright, when "he found no place for repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears;" and the threatenings of Divine Wisdom, that there is a time when "they shall call upon Me, but I will not answer."

The very heresy of Novatian implies, that apart from the Church's system, there is a difficulty; in that his sect, from denying the Church's power to forgive sin in certain cases, went on to deny all power of restoration, and all the comfort from any other Scripture to the penitent[z]. For heresy does

[z] See S. Pacian. Ep. ad Sympr. iii. init. &c.

not start gratuitously out of the mind; in whatever degree it ends by contradicting the Gospel, it starts by some plausible corruption of it. Novatianism never would have been, had the terms of the Gospel and of Holy Scripture been as easy as modern religious systems would make them. Again, these very systems, by forced solutions, show that the letter of Holy Scripture would lead to a very different result. Thus, Luther, and Calvin[a], make remission to be effected through the reminiscence of our Baptism; others, in these days, say, that on an act of faith sin is forgiven; others, again, speak of a covenant, into which we enter by Baptism, in which sin is pardoned. And it is, of course, a blessed truth that by Baptism we are made sons of God, and, as sons, have the sins effaced, "which[b], through man's frailty and infirmity, we afterwards contract;" and, if our wounds be deeper, have been brought by the Good Samaritan into that resting-place, where "sins[c] are afterwards, not taken away by regeneration, but healed by another cure." Yet certainly there is not one word in Holy Scripture of any remission of grievous sins prospectively through the Sacrament of Baptism; none of its remembrance being available to us; or of our applying *to ourselves* the promises of the Gospel; and the new covenant of which

[a] Luth. de. Captiv. Babyl. cap. de Bap. Calvin. Institt. 4. 15. § 3, 4; c. 19, § 17. Antid. Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. ad can. 10. Whence Calvin, Institt. 4, 15, 4, and 19, 17, and Melanchthon, Loci, A. 1522, call Baptism "the Sacrament of Penitence." In the Apol. Conf. Aug., penitence is admitted as a sacrament.

[b] S. Aug. de Nupt. et Concup. c. 26.

[c] Id. Ep. 98. ad Bonifac.

Jeremiah prophesied, and which S. Paul declared to be fulfilled, was one in which God's "law should be written in their hearts, and God should be their God, and they His people, and all should know Him," not, *as far as it appears from the letter of Holy Scripture*, one in which that law should be very grievously broken, very grievous sin should continually be renewed and continually pardoned. The "sins and iniquities" which "should be no more remembered," are, apparently, past, not present or future, sin; for, in connexion with this very promise, it is added, that "there[d] is no more sacrifice for sins;" and, therefore, that "if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth," since "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin," there remaineth only "a certain fearful looking for of judgment."

Not that those fearful warnings do belong to all wilful sin; blessed be God, they do not. I say this, only to illustrate how those who form to themselves theories of remission of sin distinct from the provision laid up by God in the Church, do "forsake the Fountain of living waters, and hew them out cisterns, broken cisterns, which hold no water."

There are two distinct commissions conveyed to the Apostles, and through them to the Church,—authority to baptize, and authority to remit sins to the baptized; the first not only remitting all sin, but changing the whole man, making him another self: before out of Christ, now in Christ; new-born, new-created, a member of Christ, a Son of God, new-

[d] Heb. x. 16—27.

formed "after the image of Him Who created Him." Such a re-creation there cannot again be. In Baptism, a man becomes a new self, and being another man, has no more to do with his former sins, than if they had been committed by another[e], except to love and thank God who had freed him from them; by Absolution, pardon is given, life is renewed, but the penitent is the same as the sinner. In Baptism, sins are suddenly and painlessly blotted out through grace; deep sins after Baptism are forgiven, but upon deep contrition which God giveth: and deep contrition is, for the most part, slowly and gradually worked into the soul, deepening with deepening grace, sorrowing still more, as, by God's grace, it more deeply loves; grieved the more, the more it knows Him Whom it once grieved, and through that grief and love inwrought in it by God, the more forgiven. So then, by the very order of God with the soul, (except when He leads it in some special way, and by the Cross and His own overflowing love blots out the very traces of past sin and its very memory,) continued sorrow is not only the condition of continued pardon, but the very channel of new graces, and of the renewed life of the soul. Sorrow,

[e] S. Augustine speaks thus of his sins *before* Baptism: "Thou revilest my past ills; what great thing dost thou herein? I am severer against my ills than thou; what thou revilest I have condemned. Here we live ill, which I confess; and in proportion as I rejoice in the grace of God, so do I for my past sins—what shall I say—grieve? I should grieve, were it still I. But what shall I say? joy? Neither can I say this; for would it had never been I! Yet whatsoever I have been, in the Name of Christ, it is past." (In Ps. 36. Serm. 36, § 19. See S. Aug. Conf. p. 223, note O. T.)

as it flows on, is more refined, yet deeper. To part with sorrow and self-displeasure would be to part with love; for it grieveth, and is displeased because it loves. Again, sins before Baptism come not into judgment at all; they belonged to one who is not; in Baptism he was buried and died, and a new man, with a new life and a new principle of life, was raised through the Resurrection of Christ. Grievous sins after Baptism are remitted by Absolution; and the judgment, if the penitent be sincere, is an earnest of the Judgment of Christ, and is confirmed by Him. Yet the same penitent has yet to appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, that, according to his sincerity, the Lord may ratify or annul the judgment of His servants.

Yet with these limitations, the pardon upon penitence is as absolute as in Baptism itself. Indeed, the commission to set free from sins, has by ancient fathers[f] been thought, in a secondary way, to include the power of Baptism; it is one power, and one pardon, and One Blood[g] diversely applied.]

[f] S. Cyr. Al. ad loc. S. Cypr. Ep. 73, § 7, p. 247, O. T. S. Firmilian, Ep. 75, § 17, p. 279. S. Pacian. Ep. ad Sympr. i. § 11, 12, p. 325. S. Ambr. de Pœnit. i. 8, § 36. S. Greg. Mor. 28, § 18.

[g] "What is written, 'and the Blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin,' is to be understood both of the Confession of Baptism and of the clemency of penitence." S. Jer. c. Pelag. L. 2. c. 7. Add c. Pelag. L. 1. c. 33. (explaining typically Deut. xix.) "he is bid to flee to the city of refuge, and there to abide until the High Priest die, i. e. until he be redeemed by the Blood of the Saviour, either in the house of Baptism, or in penitence, which imitates the grace of Baptism, through the ineffable clemency of the Saviour, who willeth not that any should perish, nor hath pleasure in the death of sinners, but that they should be converted and live."

This commission, upon which the authority of the Church rests, as it has ever been understood by the Church itself, was given, in part in different words, at three different times. Before the Resurrection, first to St. Peter, as a type of unity: "I give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven[h]; and then, in the same words[i], to all the Apostles;—both these in promise; and then to all in fulfilment[k], in that solemn inauguration, the commencement of their Apostolate, with the visible token that the Comforter, Who proceeded from Him, came upon them: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." Full of majesty and awe is the commission, full of instruction. The greatness of the power intrusted to man might well exceed our belief, and make us tremble to execute it, and almost doubt, as men have doubted, whether they had it. "What angel in Heaven," says our own Hooker[l], "could have said to man as our Lord

[h] Matt. xvi. 19. [i] Ib. xviii. 18. [k] Euthym. ad loc.

[l] Eccl. Pol. v. 77, 1. Hooker continues in the fervid passage so well known: "The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth men from the earth, and bringeth God Himself down from heaven; by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible grace: it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that Flesh Which was given for the life of the world, and that Blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive. O wretched blindness, if we admire not so great power, more wretched if we consider it aright, and, notwithstanding, imagine that any but God can bestow it!"

did to Peter, 'Feed My sheep: Preach, Baptize: Do this in remembrance of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained: and their offences in heaven pardoned whose faults you shall on earth forgive!' What think we? are these terrestrial sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above?" So then our Lord premises His commission with those full brief words, conveying at once both the extent of the commission, and a rule and guidance in it. "As My Father hath sent Me, even so[m] send I you." The very words are beforehand a comfort to the penitent. For to whom was our Lord sent, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to seek and to save that which was lost, to "those who needed a Physician" and knew their need, to "call not the righteous but sinners to repentance[n]?" "He sets forth at once," says S. Cyril[o], "the dignity of the

[m] As far, then, as was possible for man, like Himself, *in the like end* of their mission, the salvation of man (S. Cyril in the text); *in the like powers*, intrusted to them, but inherent in Him; in Him unerring, in the successors of the Apostles liable to error; ("Those things peculiar to God Alone, to absolve sin, these He promises Himself to give." S. Chrys. on S. Matt. xvi. 18, and S. Ambr. in Ps. xxxviii. § 37: "The Lord gave to the Apostles what before was reserved to His own judgment, the loosing of sins by the mercifulness of remission, that what should speedily be loosed might not remain long bound;) *in the like way;* (see S. Cyril below in the text.)

[n] Quoted by S. Cyril, ad loc.

[o] Ad loc. S. Cyril unites the office of teaching as one part of the object of *this* gift of the Holy Ghost, or rather he contemplates that gift as a whole, in its varied bearings. Authority, power to forgive sins, working of miracles, wisdom, and all the divers operations of the Spirit, are thus included in this gift. Yet this does not, of course, involve any confusion. S. Cyril passes from one to the other; Calvin, &c. resolve all into one, teaching.

Apostolate and the incomparable glory of the power given them, and suggests, as it seems, the path of Apostolic offices. For if He deemed right so to send His own disciples as the Father sent Him, how must not they who are to be followers of them, needs have in view, to what end the Father sent the Son?—Comprehending then in few words the Apostolic office, He said that He sent them as the Father sent Him, that they might thence know that they ought to call sinners to repentance, to heal the sick in body or in spirit, in all the orderings of their doings not to seek any how their own will; and, as far as was possible, by their Doctrine to save the world."

And as He Himself was "anointed by the Spirit to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound," so when He sent them in His stead, He imparted to them the Comforter, Who being from Himself as from the Father, was to replace Himself. "When He had said this, He breathed upon them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost." As an earnest at once of the gift to be bestowed at the Day of Pentecost[p], and a gift

[p] "Then first after His Resurrection, which the Gospel calls His 'glorifying,' He gave to His disciples His Holy Spirit." S. Aug. Tr. 32, § 6. "The Apostles had received the power of remitting sins then also, when after His Resurrection He breathed on them and said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins,' &c. "A larger grace and more abundant inspiration was reserved for that perfection which was to be bestowed upon the Apostles, whereby they might both receive what they had not yet received, and what they had received, might be able to have more surpassingly." S. Leo, Serm. 2. de Pentec. c. 4.

of sanctification for this immediate office[q], and to show that the Holy Spirit, Who should come from above, is from Him also, and Consubstantial from Himself[r], and that He Who created man in His own Image, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, was now about to re-create them in a more Divine and perfect way by union with Himself[s], "He breathed upon them," and imparted to them the Holy Ghost. And then He saith to them the solemn words, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

[In this commission, weighty authorities have supposed the power of baptizing also to be included.

[q] S. Chrys. ad loc. "One would not mistake, who should say that then also they received a certain spiritual power and grace, but not so as to raise the dead and work miracles, but so as to forgive sins. For different are the gifts of the Spirit. Wherefore, He added, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted,' showing what kind of operation He gave."

[r] S. Cyril Al. ad loc. S. Aug. ad loc. "By breathing on them, He signified that the Holy Ghost was not the Spirit of the Father, but His own also:" and de Gen. ad lit. x. § 8. "That Breath from the Body of the Lord was not the Substance of the Holy Spirit, but it was signified that the Holy Spirit so proceeded from Him, as that Breath from His Body."

[s] S. Cyril Al. ad loc. Euthym. ad. loc. S. Aug. in Joh. Tr. 32, § 6. "He breathed on their face, Who by His breath quickened the first man, and raised him from the miry clay; by which breath He gave life to his limbs, signifying that He it was Who breathed on their face, that they should arise from the mire and renounce miry works." S. Basil. de Sp. S. c. 16, § 39. "The Lord, renewing man, and restoring to him the grace from the in-breathing of God, which he had lost, when He had breathed upon the face of His disciples, what saith He? 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' &c." Add S. Ambr. in Ps. 118. Serm. 10. § 16, 17.

And, according to that fulness of Holy Scripture, whereby, beyond the immediate object of the words, they, like the Eyes of the Lord, look every way, they may include all forgiveness, wheresoever or whensoever sins are remitted through the agency of man. And so in those other words, "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth," it may well be thought that words of larger meaning were purposely chosen to express the fulness of the authority given; and so that not the power to remit sins only, but that also was included which the Apostles and the Church have since exercised, to change customs and rites, fasts and holydays and public worship, make what they saw to be for edification binding upon the conscience, and what (not being essential) ceased so to be, to loose. But the largeness of the meaning of Holy Scripture hinders not its definiteness. Light from the Father of lights, it envelopes all in its brightness, yet rests in its full intensity upon each single spot which it lightens. So far from this union with Holy Baptism any how diminishing from the power of the keys, it increases its solemnity; for it brings it the nearer to the greatness of that Sacrament[t], which,

[t] See S. Ambrose (above, p. 7). S. Cyril Al. ad loc.: "Guided by the Spirit they remit or retain sins, in two ways, as I suppose. For either they call those to Baptism, who, for the seemliness of their life and their approved faith, ought to obtain it, or they hinder and exclude from the Divine Grace [i. e. from Baptism] some who are not as yet worthy of it. Or in another way, they remit and retain sin, correcting the children of the Church when sinning, and pardoning them when repenting; as Paul delivered the fornicator at Corinth to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved, and again received him," &c. S. Leo, Ep. 108, ad Theod. c. 1: "The

issuing from our Lord's Side, unites with Himself. The power of the keys is not thereby excluded (as Novatian taught), if Baptism be therein included; but if they be thus joined together, then Absolution, as a second power of remission lodged with the Church, partakes the more of the character of the first, restoring the returning penitent to the state of grace from which he had fallen, cleansing anew the white robes which he had defiled, remitting the guilt, and opening the avenues to the full inflow of grace which sin had choked. Yet, however the solemn words may be supposed also to include the remission in Baptism, it is even more natural to understand them primarily, of some distinct gift of remission. For every thing in the action of our Blessed Lord and His words, is distinct from His commission to baptize, whereas the very words point to that other promise of our Lord, also recorded by S. Matthew, "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord gave to His Apostles the authority to teach, to baptize, to remit sins; yet although to preach is to bid men "repent and be converted, that their sins be blotted out;" and Baptism is "for the remission of sins;" He calleth each by its own name, and no where doth He call the office of baptizing to "forgive, or remit sins." In giving "the power of keys," He speaks of it also as a strictly personal office; "Whatsoever

manifold mercy of God in such wise succours man in his fall, that not only by the grace of Baptism, but also by the medicine of penitence, the hope of eternal life is restored." (See the whole passage, note M on Tertull. p. 391.) S. Chrys. de Sacerdot. (in the text below, p. 42.)

ye shall loose," "*Whose soever* sins *ye* shall remit?" He gives them special authority to this end; "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." He giveth them the Holy Ghost; "He clotheth them with power," says S. Cyril, "and transformeth them into somewhat other than they have been." To perform a Divine office, He clotheth them with a Divine power[u]; and to fit them for the ministry of their office, He imparteth the Holy Ghost, Whose is the right[v]

[u] "What the priests perform below, that God confirms above; and the Lord ratifies the sentence of the servants. What then hath He given them but all the heavenly power? For He saith, 'Whose soever sins ye remit,' &c. What power can be greater than this? 'The Father hath given all judgment to the Son.' But I see them intrusted with the whole by the Son." S. Chrys. de Sacerd. iii. 5. See Theoph. ad loc. and p. 26, note (m) above, and Hooker, above, p. 25, n. (l).

[v] Consider this, too, that He Who hath received the Holy Ghost, hath received also the power of binding and loosing sin. For so it is written, 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted: and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained.' The man who cannot forgive sins hath not the Holy Ghost. The gift [munus] of the Holy Ghost is the office of the priest; but the power [jus] of the Holy Ghost is in loosing and binding sins; how then do they [the Novatians] claim *His* gift, whose right and power they mistrust? S. Ambr. de Pœnit. 1, 2, § 8. "In that He said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' it appears plainly, that they do not this thing of themselves, but the Holy Spirit through them, as He saith in another place, 'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.' But the Holy Ghost is in such wise present in the Prelate or Minister of the Church, that if he be not a hypocrite, the Spirit worketh through him, and his reward to everlasting salvation, and their regeneration or edification, who, through him, are either consecrated, or have the Gospel preached. But if he be a hypocrite, (since most truly is it written, 'the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee the deceitful,') the Holy Spirit is wanting to his salvation, withdrawing Him-

and the power to forgive sins. It was one of the expedients to which the Novatians were brought, when the Church, against their hard-hearted heresy, urged her Divine commission to remit sins, that they limited our Lord's words to the commission to baptize, although in these words He saith nothing of that commission, and in giving that commission He used none of the words or actions which He here employeth. They interlaced the two narratives of the Gospels, in order that no power might seem to be conveyed by the one, besides what was given in the other. "Thou joinest together," says S. Pacian [w] to the Novatian, "clauses from two Evangelists, so as to seem one. What sayest thou? Do the two Evangelists relate meanings, mutually halved between them, and but half entire; were they mutually deficient in language or in reason? Or did not in each the Holy Spirit fill the whole man, carrying out entirely the sense proposed, and defining the words even to the full?"]

But when we understand our Blessed Lord in the plain meaning of His words, of a power lodged in His Church to forgive sins in His Name, then the very words themselves express the fulness of the pardon. As our Lord sent His Apostles in the same way in which the Father had sent Him, so the

self from thoughts which are without understanding, but He forsaketh not His ministry, whereby through him He worketh the salvation of others." S. Aug. c. Ep. Parm. ii. § 24.

[w] Ep. 3, ed Sympr. § 25, p. 347, where he argues more at length). The Novatian is exactly followed by Chemnitz, Exam. Concil. Trid. 6; Sess. 4. Can. 1, 2, and Zwingli (see note B, p. 75). Calvin also limits John xx. 28, to Baptism; Antid. Conc. Trid. sess. 4, c. 15; Opp. T. 8. p. 247.

word by which He expresses the power to forgive, is the very word by which He Himself forgave. "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them" (ἀφέωνται), is the blessed echo of His own words; "Son be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee" (ἀφέωνται)—the very word, by which He prayed for His murderers and all penitents upon the Cross, and teaches us in His own prayer, when we pray, to ask for forgiveness; the very word under which He declared that "all sins and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men;" spake of the entire forgiveness by our Heavenly Father to those who forgive; for the fulness of which the Scribes disputed His authority, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" by which He claimed that power to Himself, "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power upon earth to forgive sins[x];" and now in the same words He leaves it to those, whom He left in His Name to carry on His work on earth. But if any would restrain this to the Apostles only, "why," as S. Pacian[y] says, "do they not in the like way restrain Baptism also?" Either both were confined to the Apostles only, or both were committed to that Church with which our Lord promised to be "always to the end of the world;" by Baptism, to remit all sin original or actual; by Absolution, to remit all which, by the frailty of our nature, any may afterwards contract; by Baptism to bring into His fold, by Absolution to restore those who had wandered from it.

[x] Matt. ix. 2, &c. Luke xxiii. 24. Matt. vi. 12, &c. xii. 31, &c. vi. 12. 14, 15. Luke vi. 37. vii. 49. Matt. ix. 6, &c.

[y] Ep. 1, ad Sympr. § 11, 12.

What sins then may there be remitted? All which are not excepted; and these are none. "He saith," says S. Pacian[z], "'whatsoever ye shall loose.' He excepted nothing whatever. 'Whatsoever,' He says, great or small." ["God," saith S. Ambrose[a], "maketh no distinction, Who promised His mercy unto all, and without any exception granted to His priests the power of loosing. Only whoso hath heaped up sin, let him heap up penitence; for greater sins are washed away with greater tears."] All may be forgiven, for which God puts into the heart the desire to be forgiven. The unpardonable sin is therefore alone not forgiven[b], (S. Augustine says,) because the sinner asks not for forgiveness.

Nothing can be more absolute than the words, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." No sin then is excepted for its greatness; none for their multitude. He saith, "Whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" no sinner is excepted, however deeply ingrained by old, inveterate, accumulated sins; though his sins be upon him and weigh him down that he be not able to look up, and defile his memory, and cloud his faith, and destroy the power of other ordinances, and chill the heart, and weaken the will, or even bring on him relapses, let him, with earnest purpose, lay

[z] Ep. iii. 27. [a] De Pœnit. i. 3, § 10.

[b] Enchir. c. 83. "But he who, not believing that sins are remitted in the Church, despises so great bountifulness of the Divine gift, and in this obstinacy of mind closes his life, is guilty of that unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, in Whom Christ forgiveth sins." Add Fulgent. de Rem. Pecc. i. 24, B. P. ix. p. 219. See further, "The Unpardonable Sin," a sermon by the author.

down his sin at our dear Lord's Feet, hating them for His love's sake Who has so loved him; and He has said, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them."

Nor again doth He put us off for that forgiveness to a distant day. The effects of sin upon the soul may often be to be worked out by sorrow and toil; the forfeited crown and larger favour of Almighty God to be gained by subsequent self-denial or suffering for Him or devoted service. But we have the very craving of our hearts. Our sins, when we are fit to receive the blessed words, are forgiven at once. "They *are*," our gracious Lord says, "forgiven unto them (ἀφέωνται);" as though He would express the swiftness of His pardon, in the same way as it is promised in the Prophet, "Thou shalt call and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry and He shall say, Here I am;" so now, so soon as His Priest has, in His Name, pronounced His forgiveness on earth, the sins of the true penitent are forgiven in Heaven, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they *are* remitted unto them."

[All then combines to induce us to receive unhesitatingly the heavenly gift. Every thing in and around our Blessed Lord's words, the solemn investment of the Apostles with His own power, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you:" the imparting of the Holy Spirit for this office, which is the work of the Spirit; the solemn simplicity and absolute distinct meaning of His words, which, taken plainly, cannot fall short of the sense in which the Church has ever understood them; the unvarying agreement of the Church in so understanding them, assure our

faith that He hath not left us comfortless, but hath left others with His authority, to convey to sinners in His Name the forgiveness of their sins. And with this key, all which we might have doubted about or feared as to other Scripture, is opened to us. The fulness of the words with which our Lord gives power to remit sins, is the very antidote to the heresy of Novatian; and those awful passages which shut out some sin, cannot exclude any sin which *can* sue for pardon, since He has said, "Whose soever sins ye remit." We see that the parables of our Lord's love for sinners apply to those too who have anew perished, since He has Himself provided for the restoration of penitents; we see that they may be at once forgiven, and so to us too belong those promises of the swift forgiveness of our sins; and we may take boldly David's words, "I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord, and so Thou forgavest the wickedness of my sins." He provides for their complete, absolute remission; so to us also are said, the comfortable words of the Prophet, "Though thy sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow."] The word ἀφέωνται contains in one a whole Gospel of forgiveness—a whole volume, filled within and without, and traced by the finger of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, all that the penitent's heart craves for, full, present, absolute, universal forgiveness and release.

And then, too, the Psalms which the Church daily puts into our mouths; the histories of penitents which she recites to us as ensamples; the Evangelic prophet; all with the depth of their sorrows and the gladness of their restoration, may belong to us;

all, in the words of our good Bishop Andrewes, "The writings of the law, the oracles of Prophets, the melody of Psalms, the instruction of Proverbs, the experience of Histories," each supply some separate note in the Divine harmony of that Angel-chorus, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men."

Surely, then, our reverent Hooker[c] has well said, "I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that when a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst." [How is it consistent with reverence for our Blessed Lord, when He has said, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," to go about for meanings of His words, other than they seem to mean? Can we think that He would have used words which seem to mean so much, had He meant so little as some would understand by them? Would He who "knew what was in man," and who came to teach us lowliness, have given to the stewards of His mysteries their commission in words so lofty, and which (as men now think) must, if taken as He spake them, foster pride? It was no new thing of which our Blessed Lord was speaking, but what He had Himself used "on earth," the "power to forgive sins." And now He saith to His Apostles, "*As* My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you," and He who on earth forgave sins, says to those whom He sent in His Name, "Whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven." Our Lord exercised on earth two personal offices, to "preach the Gospel to the poor," and to "forgive sins." Can we

[c] Eccl. Pol. v. 59, 2.

think that He would have given His Apostles their office in terms which express the one only, had He meant only the other? Had He meant (as men have said), "To[d] whomsoever ye preach the Gospel and they believe it," or "to[d] whomsoever ye shall announce remission of sins, and they shall believe the Gospel preached by you," or "to[e] whomsoever ye attest the remission of sins," or "when[f] ye confirm pious consciences by the promises of the Gospel in the hope of freedom and remission," who can think that He would have expressed this by words which sound so different? A reverent mind would hardly so practise upon His words, as to say, (to which all these explanations come,) that "Go preach the Gospel" and "whose sins ye remit" are one and the same thing[g].]

Why then do men shrink back from this plain meaning of our Lord's words? Why but for some imaginations of inherent unfitness, that they cannot reconcile to themselves how we should have such treasure in earthen vessels, how this power should be intrusted to those who might not use it aright, or might make it but an occasion of sin.

[It is indeed an awful "honour," to use the words of S. Chrysostom[h], "which the Holy Spirit hath vouchsafed to His Priests.—While conversant here on earth, they are commissioned to dispense the things of heaven, and receive a power which God hath not

[d] Zwingli, ad loc. See note A at the end.
[e] Musculus and Calvin, ad loc.
[f] Calv. Instt. iv. 1, 22.
[g] Zwingli, l. c. and P. Martyr, Serm. in loc.
[h] De Sacerdot. iii. 5. init. See Hooker, above, p. 28.

conferred on Angels or Archangels; for to them hath it not been said, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.'"] But is it then a new thing for God to "perfect praise through babes," or overcome wisdom by folly, or make weakness His strength? "O wretched unbelief," says a father[1], "who deniest to God His own proper qualities, simplicity and power?" Is it not, on that very account, more according to all the analogy of God's dealings since the foundation of the world? Hath not He, Who hung the earth upon nothing, and has made sand the bound of the proud waves of the sea, and man, of all the weakest, the Lord of this earthly creation, when he had breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and cast around him the robe of original innocency, hath not He ever shown His Almightiness in seeming weakness, that it might be seen that the excellency was of Him? [What were the ark of Noah, and the rod of Moses, and his feeble, upstayed arms, which won victory over Amalek, but types of the Cross, mighty and victorious in weakness? What the line of the Redeemer's descent through the younger, as Seth, and Shem, and Abraham, and Isaac, begotten "of

[1] Tert. de Bapt. c. 2. p. 256, O. T. He proceeds: "What then? Is it not wonderful that death should be washed away by a mere bath? Yea, but if, because it is wonderful, it be therefore not believed, it ought on that account the rather to be believed. For what else should the works of God be but above all wonder? We ourselves also wonder, but because we believe: while unbelief wondereth and believeth not; for it wondereth at simple things, as foolish, and at great things, as impossible."

one as good as dead," and Jacob, and Judah, and David, and Solomon, but an image that God would choose "the weak things of the world to confound the mighty?"] When has He not used means, inadequate, in order to bring about His ends? [What was Israel itself, who were as grasshoppers in their own sight, to subdue the seven nations, images of the seven deadly sins which war against the soul, or the stone and sling of David, or "the sword of the Lord and of Gideon," or Jael, or the hornet which He sent before Israel, or the children of the barren, as Isaac, and Samuel, and John Baptist, or the "feeble Jews," through whom He restored Israel after the captivity, but preachers of the one great truth, that God brings not about His ways as our ways? So that if in any case He makes use of might, He either subdues it, and Samson's strength becomes available through the Nazarite's vow, and Moses' through old age, or it is a type of Anti-Christ, hating Him while serving His ends in purifying His people. What more strange thing is it, that He, through the voice of a man, should forgive sins, than that through clay, which would blind, He should give sight, or, through stopping the ears, should open them: or that His voice should awaken the dead, who of themselves could not hear it; or that He should command the winds and sea, and they should obey Him?] How is it stranger than that the Lord should hearken to the voice of a man, and the sun obey the voice of him who said, "Sun, stand thou still;" or that, through the indwelling of His Spirit, the voice of the tent-maker in bonds should make Felix tremble, and almost persuade a

king in his pomp to belong to the "sect every where spoken against," or subdue the Imperial City, and silence the wise of this world, and run through the world, making Jew, and Greek, and Barbarian, obedient to the faith[k]? "It is not ye that speak," saith our Lord, "but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." "That man from the earth," says S. Gregory the Great[l], "might have so great power, the Creator of heaven and earth came to earth from heaven, and that the flesh might judge spirits, the Lord, made Flesh for man, vouchsafed to bestow this upon him, because thereby did human weakness rise beyond itself, that Divine Might was made weak below itself." It may be one of the fruits of the Incarnation, and a part of the dignity thereby conferred upon our nature, that God would rather work His Miracles of grace through man, than immediately by Himself. It may be part of the Mystery of the Passion, that God would rather bestow Its fruits, through those who can suffer with us, through toil and suffering, than without them. It may be part of the purpose of His Love, that love should increase while one member suffers with another, and relieves another. [Yet certainly such a "ministry of reconciliation" He hath not committed to the Angels who rejoice over it, as neither by them, but "through the Priests of God," says S.

[k] See the magnificent passage of S. Chrys. Hom. 32, on Rom. xvi. 24. p. 506, sqq. Oxf. Tr.

[l] Dial. ii. 23, add S. Hilary, in Ps. 67, § 35. "When He saith to Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,' it is a Voice full of power, to be able to bestow so much on human weakness."

Chrysostom[m], "do we put on Christ, are buried with the Son of God, and become members of that Blessed Head," Christ Jesus; "by them," he says, "we are not only regenerated, but the sins after this they have power to remit."]

God, indeed, when He intrusteth man with His Divine Authority, doth not part with it so as to confirm that which through the sin, either of him who useth it, or him for whom it is used, is done contrary to His Will. "Pardon," says S. Pacian[n], "is in such wise not refused to true penitence, as that no one thereby prejudgeth the future Judgment of Christ." "We do not," says S. Cyprian[o], "anticipate the judgment of the Lord Who will come to judge, but that, if He shall find a sinner's penitence full and entire, He will then ratify what has been determined by us. But if any have deluded us by a feigned penitence, God, Who 'is not mocked,' and Who 'looketh on the heart' of man, will judge of those whom we have not seen through, and the Lord will correct the sentence of His servants." Yet doth not God less, through His servants what is done aright in His Name, because others speak in that Name perversely. He spake through His true Prophets, although others whom He sent not, in His Name "prophesied deceits;" He said to His Priests, "Ye are gods," giving sentence through the Name of God; although to such as judged unjustly, He said, "Ye shall die like men." Baptism is not less

[m] De Sacerdot. iii. 6.

[n] Ep. 1, ad Sympr. fin. p. 327.

[o] Ep. 55, § 15, p. 126. Comp. § 24, p. 135. Ep. 57, § 3, p. 139 and 30, § 11, p. 68.

"the laver of regeneration," because it benefits not those who receive it feignedly; nor is the Holy Eucharist less the Bread of Life, because to those "who will presume to receive it unworthily," "it doth nothing else than increase their damnation." He doth not the less speak through those who preach His Gospel, because others "proclaim" or preach "Christ out of envy and strife;" nor doth He less by the Church loose true penitents, because they who come feignedly to His Ordinance, do, by this fresh sin, but rivet all their former sins faster upon them.

My whole object, brethren, in all this which I would say, is the comfort of penitents, according to the provisions which our Church has made for them. Elsewhere[p] I have sought, from the practice of primitive antiquity, to vindicate the practical state of our Church, in which confession is dispensed with as matter of necessity, and left to the consciences of individuals. Yet certainly they who leaving private confession discretionary, put their hand to the work of restoring public discipline, thought not that things would be amongst us as they now are; for Ridley spake of public discipline as "one[q] of the marks whereby the true Church is known in this dark world," and Latimer[r] (with others) saith, "To speak of right and True Confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing."

[p] Note M on Tertullian, p. 379, sqq. (Library of the Fathers.)

[q] Certaine Conferences betwene Dr. N. Ridley and Mr. H. Latimer, quoted in Wordsworth, App. p. 135.

[r] Serm. on the Third Sunday after Epiph. quoted by Wordsworth, App. p. 69, and Ridley, ib. p. 71.

Yet God, who in His Wisdom suffered their designs to come to nought[s], has thereby the more cast upon the Church herself, and we may trust, would make her discipline the purer, in that He has deprived her of all outward aid in restoring it. And we may even be thankful that the rules which remain[t], requiring all her members to partake of her ordinances, have passed into disuse. For this is most certain, that to encourage indiscriminately the approach to the Holy Communion, without a corresponding inward system whereby they, who are entitled so to do, should know intimately the hearts of those whom they so encourage, has brought with it an amount of carelessness and profanation, which, if known, would make many a heart of those who have so done, sink and quake.

It is, then, we may trust, of God's manifold mercy to this portion of His Church, that He has, at the same time, by His Providence allowed almost all remains of that outward compulsory system to be broken down; and by His Spirit within has aroused, and is arousing, people's consciences more and more, to desire the full provisions which He has laid up in her for wounded souls. For so shall the whole be the more seen to be His work, and discipline be not the constraint of the disobedient, but, as oftentimes in the oldest times[u], the longed-for refuge of earnest

[s] See the account of the several attempts to restore public discipline frustrated, Wordsworth, App. p. 41, sqq.

[t] See 8th Rubric, at the end of the Communion Service, and Can. 22.

[u] See notices of voluntary confession with a view to public penitence, in note M on Tertullian, S. Aug. de quæstt. 83. q. 26. Serm. 232, § 8. 351. de Pœnit. § 7, and Hooker, vi. 4. 6.

minds, the binding-up of the broken-hearted, the austere yet loved chastisement of the flesh, "that the soul may be saved in the Day of the Lord." We can bear no sudden restoration. But in this and all things we need but patiently to wait for His Hand, Who is so graciously and wonderfully restoring us. That type of fatherly rule must be the characteristic of our Church; "volentes per populos dat jura." "The people shall be willing in the day of Thy power."

We must patiently await, until God gives to parents more anxious care for the children, or more confidence in her ministers, or to us more skill in guarding the souls of youth. All will be well with our Church, if man outruns not by his impatience the deep orderly movements of the Spirit of God. Yet since on this very subject, unhappily a vague suspicion in general prevails among us, and this is fostered now by the circulation of the work of an infidel[v] of impure mind in another land, we need the more the common warning, which has been raised again and again during the last three centuries[w],

[v] Michelet. His work bears no appearance of being founded upon facts as to the abuse of this sacred office. It is the theory of an irreligious mind passing judgment upon holy relations, which, being unholy, it cannot understand (1 Cor. ii. 14); viewing spiritual things through the medium of a carnal mind, and hating the Priestly Office, as being an opposing influence, necessarily, if it is faithful, at war with "the world."

[w] See in Wordsworth's Sermon and Appendix, *Bp. Andrewes* (p. 73), *Overall* (p. 74), Moreton (p. 76), *Dr. Donne* (p. 78), Abp. Ussher, *Bramhall* (p. 79), Bp. Cosin (p. 81), Heylin, Hammond (p. 83), Bp. Taylor (p. 89), South, Hickes, Collier, Marshall, and add Bp. Sparrow (Serm. on Confession of sins and

that amid any corrupt abuses, through man's wickedness, of the individual application of the power of the keys, we ourselves lose not its healthful use. According to the state of the Church, the influence of the Clergy must raise or depress the people committed to their charge; they will, by God's appointment and gracious help, aid to lift them up towards Heaven, or with them they will sink deeper into Hell. And the more sacred and nearer the intercourse, the more blessed must it be, or the more

the power of Absolution). "Confess, as the Church directs us; confess to God, confess also to the Priest, if not in private in the ear, since that is out of use (*male aboletur*, saith a devout Bishop, it is almost quite lost, the more is the pity); yet, however, confess as the Church appoints, publicly before the congregation, that so we may, at least by this, reap the great benefit of Absolution." Hooker's description of the ground of *voluntary* Confession in the Ancient Church implies much sympathy with it (vi. 4, 7). "Because the knowledge how to handle our own sores is no vulgar or common art, but we either carry towards ourselves for the most part an over-soft and gentle hand, fearful of touching too near the quick; or else, endeavouring not to be partial, we fall into timorous scrupulosities, and sometimes into those extreme discomforts of mind, from which we hardly do lift up our heads again; men thought it the safest way to disclose their secret faults, and to crave imposition of penance from them whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath left in His Church to be spiritual and ghostly physicians, the guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not only consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular cure of diseased minds." The case in which he recommends Confession, he thus describes (vi. 4. 16). "If peace with God do not follow the pains we have taken in seeking after it, if we continue disquieted and not delivered from anguish, mistrusting whether what we do be sufficient: it argueth that our sore doth exceed the power of our own skill, and that the wisdom of the pastor must bind up those parts, which, being bruised, are not able to be recured of themselves."

deadly. But whatsoever may be conceived of evil, in any state of the Church, from men of corrupt minds, ravening wolves in sheep's clothing, there is the less fear, when God is restoring her; whatever danger there may be, in any case, lest an unskilful Priest should convey knowledge of evil to the soul, instead of guarding it, (and too scrupulous tender care of this there cannot be, aided by constant prayer to God,) *our* peril lies not here. We are not in peril where we fear, but where we fear not. Our peril is from that, which Satan through these fears would the more hide from us, the unhindered tide of corruption, which sweeps away its tens of thousands where the heart, unopened to parent or Priest, does lie open to Satan's snares. Meantime, there is the more exceeding reason for more earnest prayer to God, to break this power and malice of Satan, and strengthen His own kingdom in the hearts of men.

But, meantime, neither this nor aught besides for which our good Bishop Andrewes prayed, as things yet "lacking to us[x]," should have any weight in diminishing the comfort of any in this our portion of the Church, in which God has bestowed upon us so many blessings from our childhood until now. It has been well said, "Pray to God for a guide, and He will give thee a guide, or Himself will guide thee." He Who is stirring people's souls to long to disburthen themselves, will not fail, among us, the hearts which he hath stirred. He will not, through

[x] Devotions, 2nd day. See Serm. IV., on Whitsunday, quoted by Wordsworth, App. p. 73, &c.

our unskilfulness, be wanting to His own Ordinance. Meantime, it is certain by the consent of the Universal Church, that whoso is truly contrite of any the most deadly sin,—all, which the Ancient Church subjected to years of penitence, and then by imposition of hands formally restored, yea, if he had on him the sins of the whole world, and longeth for Absolution, is absolved. And if the comfort is for a time withheld, while as yet he knows not to whom to turn, who knows what deeper penitence God may not amid this suspense be working in His soul? God's delays are man's benefits. "Ask, and ye shall receive."

Yet this very restoration brings new and difficult duties upon us to whom God has entrusted that most solemn and Divine office. There is no choice. Consciences are daily awakened by God's Spirit, some to the knowledge of a frightful past, others, it may be, are unduly burthened. Satan, in the absence of skilful advisers, who might guard the soul against evil, at first subtle, but very desolating, has spread his snares with a dreadful wisdom. Luxury, and the sins of a self-indulgent people, the corruption transmitted from one brief generation of youth to another, or self-originated through the early deceits of Satan, have spread among us a widely-wasting mass of evil, unknown mostly, unwarned against, and therefore the more destructive. Too many know how sin, commenced with scarce the knowledge that it was sin, has, for years of life, cankered every purpose of good; perhaps prepared for deeper, more overt, deadly sin!

Yet, whether of such or of any other sins, the

more God brings before the souls of men the awful reality of our existence, and the endless bliss or woe which hangs upon this life's breath, the deeper and more frequent must be the longing of men to disburthen their souls. With deeper sense of the sinfulness of sin, needs, new to us, but for which our Church provides, have sprung up. And we, in our several callings, must not (if we would have the blessing of God) be wanting either to the Church, or to "the sheep[z] of Christ whom He bought with His Death, and for whom He shed His Blood." Yet, blessed as the office is, and like our Blessed Lord's own, to relieve the burden of the clogged and choked heart by receiving it, still, from the experience of those who have exercised that holy ministry, it must be said that there is none so full of peril to those who have not, by penitence and mortification, or the continual sanctifying grace of God, or some sharp, penetrating, severing stroke, been deadened to the things of time, and, in the full aim and desire of their heart, are seeking to live to God. Sin is an awful thing to handle. To hear of it continually, and not be defiled with it nor dulled to it; to compassionate a fellow-sinner and be austere with self; to hear of the defilement of every sense, and keep watch over his own, comes not from man himself, but from the continued, preserving, guarding, refreshing grace of God, which keeps the whole man stayed upon, looking to, sealed by, Him. It is, then, a call the more to us so to cleave fast to God, that those committed to our charge may rightly

[z] Exhortation in "The Ordering of Priests."

place trust in us, to be jealously watchful over ourselves, guard speech[a] habitually, if we are to receive the solemn secrets of men's inmost souls; train ourselves in holy discipline, that we may be fitted to train others, not be blind leaders of the blind; strict with ourselves, that we may know how to be tenderly careful of others; hate all the motions of sin in ourselves, that we may teach others to hate it with a holy shrinking; be fervent ourselves, that we may inspire others with a holy fervour; love Him much, Who, we trust, hath forgiven us, that we may teach others, being much forgiven, much to love; and study deep humility, and fervent prayer, lest we fall into any snare of the Devil. For as the reward is great, so is the peril. And it may often be desirable that before any exercise the Physician's office, (although none from the sense of their own unworthiness should refuse it in case of need,) he should himself lay open some festering, oppressive sin of his own bosom.

Nor is this increase of the individual application of the "power of the keys" among us, any (so to speak) new and untried use of what lies in the letter of our Liturgy. It was used in times past, nor ever

[a] This is a general caution only to persons, who may as yet not have exercised the office. It does not imply (as a Roman Catholic writer has interpreted it) any misgiving that the sacredness of confession would not be kept among us. Violation of confession would be avoided like any other sin, and hindered by the grace of God. But there are many ways, short of any thing so shocking and inconceivable, as direct violation of such a secret, against which all writers on Confession give cautions, as the Prêtre Sanctifié, Liguori, S. Charles Borromeo, B. Leonard in the "Manuel des Confesseurs," p. 467, sqq.

wholly disused, however overlaid in the lukewarmness of the last century, or overlooked in the revival of piety, when, at first, it took a direction too little influenced by the provisions of our Church. And now, again, its increased use has not been the result of any theory, or of any wish on the part of any of the priesthood, to restore what they thought to be for the benefit of the Church. It originated not in the agency of man, but in the Grace and Providence of Almighty God, shaking the inmost souls of penitents, and giving them the longing for that relief which He has appointed.

And as this, amidst the manifold distresses of this time, is a great encouragement[b] and hope for the future, (for what is from Him must prosper,) so too are the blessed fruits, which all have seen who in these later days have been called upon to exercise this sacred ministry. For gifts of grace are not of man, but the operation of our Blessed Lord, through the Holy Spirit, sanctioning among us the commission which He gave. [And so, too, may they who have witnessed this grace and gift of God, perhaps speak more to the hearts of the penitent. For it is one thing to have heard by the hearing of the ear that such gifts are owned and imparted by the Church; another to know what God hath wrought by them for human souls: one thing even (as all we who have received the holy office of the Priesthood)

[b] "The Church rightly claims the power of binding and loosing, as having true priests; heresy cannot claim it, not having priests of God. And by not claiming, it pronounces against itself, in that, not having priests, it dare not claim to itself the priestly rights." S. Ambr. de Sacr. i. 2. § 7.

to have heard those solemn words, the continual echo of our Blessed Lord's, yea, His own by His servants the Bishops to us, by which it was conveyed to each of us, and at which our souls stood in awe and were amazed: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands: Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven;" one thing to have received this holy office, as a dormant power though inherent in us, another to have seen the fruits of the gift of God, although imparted through a sinner's hands. In this way, the Ministers of Christ may venture to say, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen."]

And if any here feel the burden of past sin, some single, heavier sin, as a load upon his conscience, or some enduring evil habit, or a subtle ensnaring offence, again and again rising up against him, and mastering him, or some hateful spell of past evil doing, which seems to leave his soul in darkness, and paralyze him as to all more holy, devoted purposes;—it may be a blessed knowledge that others, like him, were once bound, and now have by God been loosed; they, like him, were once burdened, and now their lightened hearts mount up in love and thankfulness: they were once slaves of sin, now are the freedmen of God: they once strove ineffectually, struggling for a while, yet ever in the end dragged captive; now they strive victoriously in the Peace, and Light, and Love of God.

It is one of the especial blessings of this place that each is assigned to the care of one who, by his sacred office, is bound to care for his soul. Blessed

as that relation has been to many of us, more blessed far might it be to the young, would they recollect that they, with whom they are brought into this relation, are not mere guardians of discipline, but Ministers of God. And if the soul of any be burthened, they are, by the very name of their office[c], protectors, guardians, and in the place of parents. We need no new relations, but to bring into fuller life what God has given us.

Great is the grace which God oftentimes bestows, through the power of the keys, upon true penitence, which loveth or but longeth to love. He Who giveth to every one severally as He willeth, dealeth with each as He, in His Infinite Mercy and Wisdom, sees best for the needs of each, or as each is at the time fitted to receive of His Goodness. Nor must any be disappointed, if, for the time, he be even rather bewildered with the memory and multitude of his sins, or with the shame of their confession, than perceive any instant relief. Yet none in earnest ever "asked bread" of our "Heavenly Father," and "He gave them a stone;" none ever with penitent heart approached His Ordinances in His Church, and was "sent away empty." He giveth according to our longing. He Himself hath said, "Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it:" the greater our longing for His grace, the larger His grace. His Infinite Love has no bounds, but the narrowness of our souls, which, if we crave it, He will enlarge. To some He sheddeth rays of light on their darkness; to others He gives large, sensible influxes of

[c] Tutores.

grace, so that they seem borne along it as upon a tide; to others He poureth in the gift of love; to some He giveth another heart and maketh them other men, so that former sins, former besetting temptations, are, as it were, passed away; to others He giveth the grace of strength; to others a loving penitence; to others deep humility and loathing of sin; to others the brightness of His Presence, and the souls as of a little child. Yet all such gifts are of God's overflowing mercy; one only gift doth the penitent seek after, the Face of God; that He Who turned His Face away amid his sins, will "show the Light of His Countenance upon him, that he may be whole."

The restoration, on the part of God, if we be sincere, is complete. "I set before you," says S. Chrysostom[d], "not one, two, three, but many thousands, ulcered, wounded, laden with countless sins, which can be so made whole through penitence, as not to have trace or scar of their former wounds." "Scars remain[e] in the body; God, when He effaces sin, allows neither scar nor trace to remain, but with health gives freshness of beauty[f] too; with freedom from punishment, righteousness also; and makes the sinner equal to those who had not sinned;" nay, not "equal" may he be, but, says S. Gregory[g], "a life on fire with love after sin, becometh more pleasing to God than innocence which through security is listless." Only be it an ardent, kindled, fiery life, which willeth not that any of its dross, any thing dead, remain unconsumed.

[d] De Pœnit. Hom. 8, § 3.
[e] Ibid. § 2.
[f] Εὐμορφία.
[g] Past. c. 28.

What the Church offers, is not to replace penitence (as many modern systems do), but to secure its fruits; not to diminish sorrow for past sin, but to make it joyous; not to offer easy terms, but to invite to the yoke of Christ, easy, but as freeing thee from the heavy yoke of sin; easy, because He Who placeth it upon thee, shall by it uphold thee. The Church every where has in later times mitigated her strictness[h], and because she could not bring us to the severe self-discipline of the Ancient Church, would invite us, as children with weak wills, to do what we can.

She abridges the long-protracted period of penitential acts; admits at once, or rarely excludes from communion; disuses almost every where the recommendation of the stern instruments of ancient penitence, [such as even the loving, though earnest, S. Cyprian[i] speaks of, and of which our own Church[k] spoke with reverence at the beginning of the last

[h] "The Apostle doth not speak contrary to the Lord, in that he says, 'Those that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear,' whereas He saith, 'Rebuke him between him and thee alone.' Both are to be done, as the difference of the infirmity of those suggests, whom we have received in charge, not to be destroyed, but to be corrected and cured; for one is to be healed one way, another another." S. Aug. de Fid. et Op. § 4.

[i] De Laps. § 21, p. 175, Oxf. Tr.

[k] Form of Excommunication approved by Convocation, A.D. 1712. Archiep. Cant. Th. Tenison, 20 Reg. Ang. Ann. 13, quoted by Wordsworth, App. p. 35. It refers to the yet stronger language of Origen, Tertullian, and S. Ambrose (Ibid. p. 37). The language of Tertullian is quoted with respect by Bishop Hall (against the Brownists), on the Right Use of the Church. P. ii. p. 162. (Ibid. p. 78.) See also Bp. Sparrow, Sermon on Confession and Absolution (at the end of his Rationale), p. 307, ed. 1722.

century, "to spend nights in vigils and weeping, lie stretched on the ground, prostrate themselves amongst ashes, sackcloth, and dust," or long-continued fastings.] In compassion to the weakness of her children, she puts them not to open shame, nor lays upon them the burden of a heavy discipline. But God changeth not; His Holy Word remains, which counts self-"revenge" among the fruits of "sorrow after a godly sort;" the Church still rehearses to us from it the austere humiliation of Ahab and Nineveh; she still teaches us to say with the royal penitent, "every night wash I my bed, and water my couch with my tears;" "my beauty is gone for very trouble;" "I forget to eat my bread;" "for the voice of my groaning, my bones will scarcely cleave to my flesh;" she, yea, God by her, still calls to us through the prophets, to "turn to the Lord with weeping, and with fasting, and with mourning." Not the Nature of the Unchangeable God, nor of His and our unchanged adversary, fixed in everlasting hate of both, and hating us the more, as bearing the image of God; not the deadly nature of sin, nor the true character of healthful penitence are changed; not what would be good for us, if we could bear it, but what our sickly wills (and in some cases weaker frames) will bear. Better to repent any how, than not to repent at all. Yet surely they may most hope that their penitence is sincere whom it costs most; "The pains of the penitent," says S. Augustine[1], "are birth-pangs of a woman with child;" yielding, for short present pain, abiding joy. They surely, who

[1] In Ps. xlvii. § 5.

mourn most deeply, shall be most deeply comforted; "they who sow in tears, shall reap in joy;" they who, "weeping, bear forth good seed, shall come again" to their Father's everlasting home "with joy," and shall find their sheaves laid up in His garner. They, who have deeply fallen, or have turned aside, must gird themselves the more resolutely, and strip themselves of every weight, and press the more earnestly in His Blessed Steps Who hath anew called them, would they gain the Prize they once forfeited, the full brightness of His Presence in bliss, and recover the jewels of that crown which they once tarnished, or "cast on the ground, profaning it down to the dust," and the mire of concupiscence!

[Who among us shall dare to say that that, if it can be borne, is without its use, which the whole Church so earnestly commended to penitents, to further their salvation, in those centuries, to which, on this very matter of discipline, our own Homilies refer, as "the[m] days when religion was the most pure?" Which is most like the penitence of Holy Scripture or our own Commination Service, that which speaks of "prayers[n] without ceasing, frequent fastings," "to groan, to weep, to moan day and night before the Lord His God;" "as we have sinned greatly, greatly to weep;" or even those more painful, humiliating acts, the sackcloth and ashes which God accepted in Nineveh, and which our Lord names as tokens of humble, acceptable penitence[o]; or that

[m] Homily of the right use of the Church, Pt. 2.

[n] Tertull. de Pœnit. c. 9, quoted in the Form of Excommunication, l. c., and S. Cyprian, l. c.

[o] Matt. xi. 12. Luke x. 13.

which holds, that the guilt of having "defiled the temple of the Holy Ghost," "crucified the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame, and done despite to the Spirit of grace," may be effaced by a simple act of faith, without deep, searching, because loving, penitence? Did the Saints and Fathers of the Church set the penitents they cherished on useless toils? Were all those penitential tears not stored up in His bottle, those sighs not recorded in His Book? Those cries for mercy, were they needless or unheeded! Had penitents of old no reward, and was all they did and sought for a dream? or are we losing our reward, and, in our self-indulgence, "walking to and fro in a vain show," a dreamy existence, which, "in the Awakening, God will despise?"]

God is anew calling aloud to penitence. Evil days, perhaps the last strife before His Coming, are gathering thick upon us. He, by the manifold evils around us, is telling us where any, who, when called by Him to work, once said, "I will not," and have "not kept their own vineyard," may now, if they repent, go and work in the vineyard of the Lord. Every where around our crowded cities, our mines, our ports, our manufactories, are one wide desolation, often, except in the suspension of punishment, the types of Hell, for lack of devoted, self-denying service. Let those follow easy paths, who have ever trod the paths of God! let those who have ever led blameless lives, and have little stained their Baptismal robes, if God call them not, possess in thankfulness, life's pure, peaceful joys; but if thou trustest that God has forgiven thee, or will forgive thee,

much, then seek how thou mayest show forth to Him much contrition and much love; if thou trust that thou art "a brand plucked out of the fire," then see how, by what self-denial, parting with this world's goods or comforts, thou mayest, under God, aid to pluck others out of that fire which thou feelest that thou didst deserve: if thou hope, that when thou hadst made thyself "a vessel of wrath fitted for destruction," "dishonouring thine own self," "Jesus Christ" willing to "show forth in" thee "all long-suffering," would make of thee "a vessel of mercy prepared unto glory," "sanctified and meet for the Master's use,"—then, like him, the chief of penitents, the "chosen vessel to bear" his Redeemer's "Name before the Gentiles," be thou ready to "suffer for" His "Name's sake:" be thou "in labours more abundant; in weariness and painfulness; in watchings often; in hunger and thirst; in fastings often; in cold and nakedness;" yea, blessed shalt thou be, if, with him, thou be "in deaths oft;" that so in that body, which thou once didst "yield as the instrument of unrighteousness unto sin," and through "sin, unto death," thou mayest now "bear about the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in thy body," and while "death worketh in" thee, "life may work" in them who through thee shall know Him. Turn thy self-affliction to the good of thy brethren: show unto Christ, in His and thy brethren, the love wherewith thou hopest He hath loved thee; and thy displeasure at thy sins shall be the good pleasure of thy God; thy labour to efface thy past foulness, shall, through the Blood of Christ,

win for thee everlasting beauty and glory: He Whose strength is made perfect in weakness, shall make thy past weakness the means of thy future strength; the memory of past sin when thou art loosed from it, shall be, not a clog to hold thee back, but a spur to goad thee: He Who now saith, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," shall own the good deeds which He gave thee strength to do: He Who shall now say to thee by His Minister, "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee," shall, in the awful Day, when He shall be revealed in flaming fire, to take vengeance on those who obey not His Gospel, but to be glorified in His Saints,—He shall by Himself say unto thee, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Unto which He, of His infinite Mercy, bring us sinners, to Whom with the Father, &c.

NOTE A.

Reformed and Socinian Expositions of our Lord's words on the "power of the keys," on p. 38.

Zwingli does give this as an actual paraphrase of our Lord's words. "It is as though Christ said, '*To whomsoever ye preach the Gospel*, and they receive it, to them sins are remitted.' *For*, in the last chapter of Mark, He expresses this *more clearly*: 'Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth shall be saved;' i. e. whoso believeth the Gospel preached by you. The remitting of sins then is ascribed to the Apostles, *because* they *preach that through which sins are remitted;* for they preach the

Gospel, or Christ Himself, or the grace of God through Christ, by which sins are remitted. The meaning then is, 'Whose sins ye remit,' i. e. 'to whom ye shall announce the remission of sins, and they shall believe the Gospel preached by you, to them sins are remitted.'" (In Hist. Dom. Res.) *Calvin* very remarkably avoids any thing like an attempt to adapt such a sense to the words, and uses general terms only; as (Institt. iv. 1. 22) "by the ministry of the Church sins are continually remitted to us, when Presbyters or Bishops, to whom this office is entrusted, confirm pious consciences, &c. (as in the text) ch. iv. 11. 1." "This command, as to remitting or retaining sins, and that promise to Peter, as to binding or loosing, ought to be referred to nothing else than the ministry of the word, which when the Lord committed to the Apostles, He therewith bestowed on them this office of binding and loosing. For what is the substance of the Gospel, except that we all, being the servants of sin and death, are loosed and freed through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus?—It is clear that in those places (Matt. xvi. John xx.) the power of the keys is *simply the preaching of the Gospel.*" The nearest to an attempt to paraphrase the words occurs ad loc. "He commands them to attest the remission of sins in His Name, so that He should through them reconcile men to God."

In like way, *Chamier* (Panstrat. 4. 15. 3.) says that "by those words of Christ is meant the *general effect of the whole preaching of the Gospel;*" and *Peter Martyr* (Serm. in Joann. xx.). "The key is twofold; the one of preaching the Word of God, the other of believing it, when heard. One doth not open or remit sins without the other. That key is in truth nothing else than the Word of God; *not given to priests more than to others*, but to all Christians. And that Word of God is breathed upon by the Holy Spirit, and is partly preached, partly believed; and thus sins are remitted.—The keys are the Word of God; so then the Priests need not so to boast. For there are two keys, one of teaching, the other of believing. They [the Priests] use their key; yet it is not enough to open the kingdom of heaven, unless he, too, who hears, uses his and believes. The Holy Spirit is the Author of both; for, except with His aid, people neither preach nor believe aright. Yea, when Christ preached, heaven was not opened to all by His preaching, nor were sins remitted to all, but to those only who used their key and believed. We own

that by whomsoever the Word of God is spoken, it is as if it was spoken out of the mouth of God; but it does not follow from this, that all have the keys. For of those who believe and hear it is said, 'He gave them power to become the Sons of God.'—Nor is the key of using the Word of God given to the Priests alone, but to the whole Church. Whence it is the Holy Spirit who giveth the keys; but all the believers have the Spirit of Christ, else are they none of His; therefore *all have the keys.* Yet all ought not, as to the outward function, to *preach* and administer Sacraments; but Paul wisheth all to be done in order. Therefore certain, more learned and better, are chosen, who act for the whole Church, and are called ministers of the Church. For if we would all *preach* together, it would be a croaking of frogs. But *privately every one hath the keys towards his neighbour, and can deal with him through the Word of God, and if he lay open to him his sin, can comfort, admonish, exhort him out of the Word of God:* which Word of God, if he believe, his sins are forgiven him and heaven is opened; but if he believe not, sins are retained, and he is bound." *Chemnitz* (Exam. Conc. Trid. Sess. iv. c. 1, 2). The remission and retaining of sins takes place through the ministry, (Joh. xx;) by the *preaching* of the Word, Luke xxiv. *Aretius* (ad loc.) says, "the remission of sins is—that whereby we pronounce men free from the penalties of sins which the Divine vengeance would deservedly inflict. *This consists wholly in the teaching,* whereby men are taught to believe in Christ, if they would have that remission, *and besides this, there is no lawful usage of remission.*"

The Reformed school is in this exactly followed by the early Socinian, so that (as in the case of the texts of the Scripture on Baptism, see Tracts on Holy Baptism, Note P, ed. 1) they can often not be distinguished. Thus *Schlichting* (ad loc. Fratr. Pol. t. 6, p. 143): "They remitted sins to all those who believed in Jesus Christ, and led a life conformably to this faith. The Apostles remitted and retained sins, both generally and in particular. In general, they remitted sins simply to all, who believed in Christ with a true and efficacious faith. In like way, they simply retained the sins of all who would not believe in Christ. Individually, they remitted sins with an 'if,' if any one professed the true faith, and had that piety which follows it," &c. (Calvin uses the same formula). "Some say that in this way any woman could remit and retain sins. This [as to the need

of belief in Christ] any woman taught by the Apostles, can and ought to say and repeat; but the remitting and retaining of sins does not follow from the force of her saying, but it does from that of the Apostle's saying and teaching." *Wolzogen* (ad Matt. xvi. Fratr. Pol. t. 7. p. 316): "This their power consists solely in this, that, by the authority of their office, which they administered as the ambassadors of Christ, they were *to announce* to some, *remission of sins, to all* namely, *who should believe in Christ.*" *Socinus* (in Matt. xvi. 19. Fratr. Pol. t. i. p. 337): "I conclude, then, that the keys of the kingdom of heaven promised by Christ to Peter, are the commission to declare and pronounce as to all and every thing, which ought to be in those who appertain to the kingdom of heaven. But that the Apostles also had this same power, is very plain from what we have just said; nor is any thing more certain than that each of the Apostles *had the office of preaching the Gospel.* Moreover, we read that Christ Himself gave not to Peter only, but to the other Apostles also, this authority, that whose sins they should remit, &c., which, as it means the same as to have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, so also does it mean the same which we said was intended by those keys; since, by the unalterable decree of God, sins are remitted to no one who believeth not in Christ, but to every one who believeth in Christ sins are remitted; and, consequently to the one the kingdom of heaven is opened, to the other shut. This remission, then, and retaining of sins, which, being done by the Apostles, God should approve, we must needs so interpret that it should not be the act itself, but the declaration and pronouncing of it."

On the whole, the Socinian seems, on this point, rather the higher teaching; certainly higher than that of Peter Martyr.

It may further illustrate this unnatural way of interpreting Holy Scripture, to observe the violence which is done to the Sacred Narrative. St. John (xx. 19—23) relates that our Lord gave this commission to His Apostles to "remit sins" on the day of His resurrection. "Then the same day at evening . . . came Jesus and saith, Peace be unto you . . . *Then* said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you; As my Father," &c. St. John places it also distinctly before the appearance when St. Thomas was present—"But Thomas . . . was not with them when Jesus came," &c. Zwingli, following herein the Novatian

censured by S. Pacian (see above, p. 32), in order to identify this commission with that in St. Matt. xxviii. 18, actually rends the latter half of St. John xx. 21, from the former, and inserts it, together with v. 22, 23, between St. Matt. xxviii. 18 and 19. Thus, whereas St. John relates the history, xx. 19—23, as one, Zwingli arbitrarily divides it into two: whereas St. John says that it took place before the occasion when St. Thomas was present, Zwingli places the latter part afterwards: and whereas St. John relates our Lord's words thus, v. 21, "*Then* said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you, as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you;" Zwingli says that they were said on two different occasions; that the words, "Then said Jesus unto them, Peace be unto you," were said on the day of the Resurrection, (*before* "He showed to them His Hands and His side," although St. John says it was *after*,) and the latter part of the words forty days afterwards! Such is *his* "*history*, of the Resurrection of the Lord:" (Hist. Dom. Res. Opp. t. 3. p. 395 and 400.)

As the absence of St. Thomas may, and has given rise to fresh cavil, S. Cyril's answer to cavillers in his day may be added, that "Christ gave the Holy Ghost, not to certain individuals, but to the whole of the disciples. Therefore, although not present, they received It, the bounty of the Giver not being contracted to those present, but extending to the whole band of the holy Apostles." He illustrates this by the analogy of Eldad and Medad, which was itself a type.

Blessed be God,
Which hath not turned away my prayer
Nor His Mercy from me.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

ENTIRE ABSOLUTION OF THE PENITENT.

SERMON II.

JUDGE THYSELF, THAT THOU BE NOT JUDGED OF THE LORD.

A SERMON

PREACHED

BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY,

IN THE

CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, IN OXFORD,

ON THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT, 1846.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

THIRD EDITION.

OXFORD:

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1857.

BRISTOL:
PRINTED AT THE S. MICHAEL'S HILL PRINTING-PRESS.

1 Cor. xi. 31.

If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

In my last Sermon, I dwelt upon that authoritative act, whereby God, through the ministry of man, conveys His own sentence of pardon to the soul of the penitent, sets him free from the guilt of his past sins, opens to the blessed influx of His grace the channels which sin had stopped, and often pours at once large grace and love into the soul. But, since the efficacy of Absolution depends upon the penitence of him who receives it, the deeper that penitence, the fuller will be the grace. And so, since special confession, gathering into one before the soul all its greater sins, until it shrinks and recoils and sickens at the miserable sight, mostly brings with it a lowlier self-abhorrence, deepens its cry for mercy, and issues in greater love for Him Who loved it amid such loathsomeness and misery, special confession will mostly obtain more grace and have more assurance of pardon. And this I say, not (God forbid!) to lessen the comfort of such as have not been led by Him to desire any other than the general Absolution of all true penitents in the whole congregation, when confession has been made to God only, but as a source of increased comfort to laden or anxious souls who feel that they need what is

more special to themselves. The Church (I am compelled to repeat) allows us both ways. In particular cases, she recommends special Confession, and Absolution in form more authoritative. For in the Visitation of the Sick, she directs her Priests to "move the sick person to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter;" and, as Bp. Sparrow [a] adds, "It should be considered, whether every deadly sin be not a weighty matter." She would, at least, secure, that they who have, during health, neglected her warnings at the Holy Communion, and shrunk from the shame, should not pass, clogged with grievous sins, into the Presence of their Judge. We, His Priests, are not to wait for the sick man's wish; we are (if we would obey her, and it has been done of old also) ourselves to "move" the sick man, and suggest to him, that if his conscience be troubled with any weighty matter, he ought to confess it. Absolution is to be given, only on such signs of lowly contrition as betoken "true repentance,"—"if he humbly and heartily desire it," (for the Church could never command the Priest to absolve indiscriminately,) but we are directed, in all cases, to appeal to the sick man's conscience; if he, having need, despise or put it from him, he has to give account of his deed at the Judgment-seat of Christ. And can it be thought that the Church denies that in health, which she recommends in sickness? She who bids us "often to put men in remembrance to settle their temporal

[a] Rationale, ad loc.

estates in health," lest worldly matters should distract the sacred, precious, hours of sickness, would she have us put off to their sick or death-bed, if they ever see it, those who come to us in health, and tell us that they have a burthened conscience? They who would bid men delay it to such an hour, know little of sickness or of wounded consciences, or how difficult it is, while the body is enfeebled, and the head confused by weakness, or by racking or wearing pain, or strong fever, or sleepless nights, for the soul to gather itself up for any duty, much less such a weighty task as this. They who have known such hours, when the mind, far from being able to use collected thought or disentangle its maze of sins, sinks down exhausted with any effort, and can only cry in the fewest words wherein prayer can be formed, "Lord have mercy," know well that they would not, for the whole world, have to disburthen their conscience then. It is, (as they well know, who have either undergone, or, by witnessing, have shared the healthful suffering,) it is enough often, even in health, to turn the head dizzy, when the soul brings before itself the dismal heap of all the heavier sins of a whole life, which by God's grace it can recall. Even then, it must cry out, "I should have fainted, but that I believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living." And is this a task to be reserved to the death-bed? Better then, than to neglect it altogether! But who that would have it performed at all, (as the Church wisheth,) would have it reserved to a time, when every power by which it is to be dis-

charged aright, is giving way or crushed in the strong grasp of death? Or is it to be supposed, that penitents will have one "matter," one sin only, on their conscience? Does not our Gracious Lord recover His lost sheep, when wearied out by wanderings; find the piece of silver, when well-nigh buried, and His Image almost encrusted over in the mire of sin? Does He not recover penitents from the very depths of Hell? The bosom, once unlocked, pours not out one sin only. The penitent can find no rest, until he have emptied his whole conscience of all the foul matter which has gangrened there, to the very last drop. There may be some outstanding sins more prominent; but take any, the most common case of one who, through a series of years, has fallen by habitual sin, can such a conscience, think you, easily on a sick bed make "the special confession of the sins" which "trouble" it during a whole life? Is not the conscience sorely troubled by a dim, confused, memory of countless sins which it strove to hide from itself, strove often to persuade itself not to be sins, and too well succeeded, or which, by the very force of sinning, it came scarcely or not at all to regard as sins, but which, when its sense is anew quickened by God's Holy Spirit, seem to stand so thick, that the whole life seems one intricate, manifold web of sin, one only in sinfulness? Is it then so easy to recal the sins of ten, twenty, perhaps sixty, or seventy years, of an unexamined, unsifted, conscience? Ye know, if ye have ever tried it, how, when earnestly bent on the task, at

one time one sin flashes upon the conscience, then another; these spots of darkness unfold themselves to the eye, one by one, as it gazes stedfastly on them. "Often," says S. Gregory[b], "what escaped the unawakened, becomes known to the mourner. Who, reckless, knew not their guilt, detect it, when, within themselves, aroused against themselves." "The[c] growing bitterness of penitence, not only heaps up against our heart our greater sins, but even recals the very least. And all these we pursue the more resolutely, the more watchfully we strive to uproot from our heart every germ of evil." Scarce one, probably, even in fullest possession of his mind, with all the helps he can, has found that he has reached at once the depth of this dark abyss. What a task this, when perhaps the hours are numbered and the soul bewildered with the thoughts of approaching judgment, and Satan, as he often doth, is assailing him with all his force and subtlety, to plunge him into doubt or despair. Is there not enough to do in that last conflict with the Evil one, that last moment of penitence, and imploring of pardon, and faith, and hope, and love, not to burthen it with aught which can be performed before? It is an

[b] in Ps. 3. Pœnit. v. 19. §. 21.

[c] Id. in Ps. 4. Pœnit. v. 3. §. 3. on "Wash me more and more." "May my fall profit me; with this stain, may the spots of offences be washed out, which I have hitherto neglected. For often while we bewail some things done amiss, aroused by the very force of the bitterness to sift ourselves, we find in us other things to be bewailed. Which, when done, we the more easily give over to forgetfulness, as we think them either slighter or nothings. The growing bitterness of penitence, not only heaps up against our heart our greater sins, but even recals the very least. And all these we pursue the more resolutely, the more watchfully we strive to uproot from our heart every germ of evil."

axiom of religion, that what is good to be done, before we die, it is good to do *now*, lest death surprise us. It were wantonly to presume on the mercies of God, wilfully to delay to the last hour any thing which ought to be done ere we part out of life. What if there be no last hour for it? What if death come suddenly? "He[d] Who promiseth pardon to the penitent, promiseth no morrow to the procrastinator." In that the Church then bids us "move" the sick in body and soul to special confession of sins, if their consciences are "troubled with any weighty matter," she bids us receive them now, if they come to us. In that she would have us, if we need it, "moved" thereto by God's ministers in death, she must wish that God would, if we need it, move us thereto in life. What, again, if after the oil and wine have been poured into the sick man's wounds, he recover his bodily health also? It is well known that one who has once tasted "the benefits of absolution" for heavier sins, and found good for his soul in the special counsels of God's ministers, longs mostly to continue to "open his griefs" for slighter sins into which he afterwards falls; that he finds it a healthful discipline for his soul, a safeguard often, by God's grace, against sin; that God gives him thereby lightness and gladness of heart, to "go on his way," through the wilderness, "rejoicing." Is such an one to be repelled? Is he to be told that the remedy he seeks for is only for those more deeply wounded, or bid go into other folds, if he still would

[d] See S. Aug. Serm. 82. §. 14. p. 264. Oxf. Tr.

have it? Or, again, in those most sorrowful and difficult cases of relapse into very grievous sin, are we to imitate the severity of the Primitive Church, without her watchful care and tender love for penitents, and put them off to their sick or death-bed, ere they can be admitted again to hear that sentence of pardon, in which they once tasted the grace of God? No! the Church, our Mother, would not bring all her children, with their varied tempers, needs, languishings, sicknesses, under one rigid, unbending, rule. She shews, in the Exhortation to the Holy Communion, that she would deal, not with laden consciences only, but with timorous, scrupulous, doubting, tender, souls, the lambs of the flock of Christ, otherwise than she would with those who seem to themselves, or are, the strong or the whole. One thing only she excludes, when she excludes any thing, compulsory confession; "that[e] any man should be *bound* to the numbering of his sins;" "as if," adds Hooker[f], "remission of sins otherwise were impossible." But, short of this, in that Exhortation, she strives, with an austere, anxious love, to rouse the conscience, not only as to overt, but as to secret, mental, sins, "if any of you be in malice, envy, or any other grievous crime;" and then, after words, which may well shake the soul through and through, "lest after taking of that Holy Sacrament, the devil enter

[e] Homily on repentance. P. II.

[f] E. P. vi. 4. 15, quoted in "Entire Absolution of the Penitent," Serm. i. p. 12. n. 6. "They" [the Fathers] "doe not only leave it free for men to confesse or not confesse their sinnes unto other *(which is the most that we would have* :) Abp. Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit. And so others.

into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul," she straightway insists on the necessity of "a quiet conscience," and invites such as cannot otherwise quiet theirs, to open their griefs, that by the ministry of God's Holy Word, they may receive the benefit of absolution. "By the ministry," she says, "of God's Word," "for," (as I said more at large before[g],) "all forgiveness of sin, by whomsoever, or howsoever it comes to us, is from Him." "God Alone forgiveth sin." The Word of God is the authority by virtue of which the Priest acts; "men," S. Ambrose says[h], "supply their ministry" only; or as he says again[i], "Sins are remitted through the word of God, of which the Levite is the interpreter and a sort of executor: they are remitted also through the office of the Priest, and the sacred ministry."

Nor can any argument as to the judgment of the Church on this or any other subject be drawn from the mere omission of the more direct injunctions of an earlier form of our English Liturgy.[j] It had indeed

[g] Ibid p. 4. sqq.

[h] de Sp. S. iii. 10. see S. Ambrose more fully, Serm. i. p. 6—8.

[i] de Cain et Abel ii. 4. §. 15. (see, further, Note A. at the end.) Bp. Morton accordingly substitutes "the office of the Minister" as equivalent; (Appeal, p. 270. quoted by Bp. Montagu, Appeal to Cæsar, c. 35.) "And indeed the power of absolution, whether it be general or particular, whether in public or in private, it is possessed in our Church, where both in our Public Service is proclaimed pardon and absolution upon all penitents; and a private applying of particular absolution unto penitents *by the office of the Minister*. And greater power than this, no man hath received from God." So then Bp. Overall in substituting "by the Minister," (see below p. 15, n. a.) did no more, in fact, than Bp. Morton. The object of all is to express that the authority is ministerial only.

[j] Book of Common Prayer A.D. 1549. In the rubric on "special confession"

argued a rashness or fickleness in the Compilers, such as we may well shrink from thinking possible, had they altered, *as a matter of principle,* what a year before [k], they had declared to have been done "by [l] aid of the Holy Ghost." But now, on the contrary, they again affirmed it to be "a [m] very godly order," "agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church;" and so they bore witness to what they were

in "the Visitation of the Sick," there then stood, "and the same form shall be used in all private confessions." This was omitted in 1552.

[k] "The commissioners appear to have *completed* their revision of the Book of Common Prayer before the end of the year 1551." The changes began to be agitated a year after the publication of the first, Ib. p. xvi. from Heylyn, Hist. Ref. p. 106.

[l] Act for the Uniformity of Service &c. A. 2 et 3 Edv. VI.—"the Archbishop of Canterbury and certain of the most learned and discreet Bishops and other learned men of this realm having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scriptures, as to the usages of the primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient and meet order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the Sacraments, to be had and used in his Majesty's kingdom of England and Wales, the which at this time, *by the aid of the Holy Ghost* with one uniform agreement, is of them concluded."

[m] Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer &c. A. 5 et 6 Edv. VI. "When there hath been *a very godly Order* set forth by authority of Parliament, for common prayer and administration of the Sacraments, to be used in the mother tongue, within this Church of England, *agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church,* very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation &c. And because there hath risen, in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, *rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause,* therefore as well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof, as for the more perfection of the said order of common service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayer and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God &c." Whatever these last words may be meant to apply to, it is clear, 1) that the book in its earlier form is approved and the objections treated as cavils; 2) that the concessions were made to a party, whose successors went out of the Church and trampled it under foot, 3) the most material of these changes, (a very painful one) was subsequently rescinded.

compelled to withdraw, even while they suppressed its expression. Nor if we turn to the practice of her most faithful sons, shall we think *that* a new thing, or foreign to the meaning of the Church, or limited to certain cases of gross sin, which pious Hooker and Saravia habitually used; and of Hooker and good Bp. Saunderson, we hear, that at the eve of death, after receiving Absolution, "the mind of the one[n] seemed more cheerful," on the other's[o] face there seemed "a reverend gaiety and joy."

[n] Walton's life of Bp. Saunderson, Lives, ii. p. 258. Oxf. 1805.

[o] Ib. i. p. 345, 6. He received it as a preparation for his last Communion, after which this effect was seen. It was the day before his blessed death. *Bp. Andrewes* also says of himself in his "private prayers," "Who hast opened a door of hope *to me, confessing* and entreating, through the power of the mysteries and of the keys. (John. xx. 22. Matt. xvi. 19.)" p. 258, ed. Hall. Bp. Taylor, again, even where he complains of the rareness of Confession amongst us in his times, implies that it *was* practised, not in sickness only, but in health. He is speaking of the easiness of absolution, in the modern Church, whether in England or the Roman Communion. "To confess and to absolve is all the method of our modern repentance, even when it is most severe. Indeed, in the Church of England, I cannot so easily blame that proceeding; because there are so few that use the proper and secret ministry of a spiritual guide, that it is to be supposed he that does so, hath long repented and done some violence to himself and more to his sins, before he can master himself so much as to bring himself to submit to that ministry." Doctrine and practice of Repentance, c. ix. s. 6. §. 68. And again, the "advice concerning Confession" in the Guide for the Penitent, which is either Bp. Taylor's or that of a like-minded contemporary, implies that it was a recognised practice. "You are advised by the Church, under whose discipline you live, that before you are to receive the holy Sacrament, or when you are visited with any dangerous sickness, if you find any one particular sin, or more, that lies heavy upon you, to disburden yourself of it into the bosom of your confessor, who not only stands between God and you to pray for you, but hath the power of the keys committed to him, upon your true repentance, to absolve you in Christ's Name from those sins which you have confessed to him." The fact that this has been a received book among us, which since Bishop Taylor's time has accompanied the Golden Grove, implies surely that the advice has been followed. A book would not continue to be popular, if a main rule in it went against people's practice. It is said also by those who have read the notices of private habits before the

Nor, again, can it be said, that, in her meaning, the solemn words "by His Authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the FATHER and of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST," relate to the removal of censures of the Church only. On the contrary, the portion of the older form[p], which rather relates to those censures, is omitted, and that part only is retained which directly relates to the remission of sins. Again, the sins which we are bidden to urge men to confess, are sins by which the penitent's conscience is troubled, sins known to himself and to God only, and these are no objects of the censure of the Church. They are sins, which the Priest knows not of, whereas a Priest could hardly be ignorant, whether one, committed to his charge, had fallen under the public censures of the Church or no. Nor, again, has the Church anywhere given to the Priest the power of removing her censures, in cases of ordinary sickness.[q]

But, in truth, the doctrine of the Church herein is very clear and explicit. She distinctly says in her Homily,[r] "Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness

Revolution of 1688, that confession and spiritual guidance were received practices.

[p] "Et sacramentis ecclesiæ te restituo." See Sarum Manual in Mr. Palmer's Antiq. of Eng. Rit. ii. 226.

[q] The instances mentioned in Bingham, 19. 3. are all cases of necessity.

[r] "Of common prayer and Sacraments." And this declaration is the stronger, because the writer of the Homily is, in that very place, contending, that "according to the *exact* signification of a sacrament, namely for the visible signs, *expressly* commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." The author of the

of sins." At our Ordination as Priests, she repeated to each of us our Lord's words,[s] "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven." Upon the special confession of the sick, she bids us absolve him; and the words of Absolution contain a rehearsal of the authority through which we do it. "By His Authority committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins" in the Name of the All-Holy Trinity, in Whose Name we received our commission. She speaks of "the benefit of Absolution," as distinct[t] from "ghostly advice and counsel," both being needed for the penitent; she retains in her Ordinations, and Absolution of the sick, the ancient words. What had this been but hypocrisy and double dealing, had she not meant it in the same sense as of old? What unreality and mockery were it of the penitent's hopes, what ashes for bread, nay, rather a scorpion, what waste of precious moments on which eternity may hang, to move the sick to confess his *sins*, and then, in solemn words, which sinful men may well tremble to use, to "ab-

Homily continues: "For although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin; yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are: and therefore Absolution is *no such Sacrament* as Baptism and the Communion are."

[s] "He" [the Jesuit] "hath done us open wrong in charging us to deny that 'Priests have power to forgive sins,' whereas the very formal words which our Ordination requireth to be used in the Ordination of a Minister are these, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, &c.'" Abp. Ussher, Answer to Challenge, p. 313.

[t] "The benefit of absolution, together with ghostly advice and counsel." Exhort. and Order of Holy Comm.

solve him," if truly penitent, "from all his *sins*," if this solemn act is not of value to his soul, or relates only to Church censures, under which these secret sins do not fall. There is no middle way. Either the Church speaks truly wherein she says, "our Lord JESUS CHRIST hath left power with His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him," or those her most solemn acts of Ordination and Absolution would be, (as those without her have alleged,) year by year and day by day, accumulated blasphemy. Of her own meaning there can be no doubt, that, deferring as she does throughout to "the Primitive Church which," she says,[u] "is especially to be followed as most uncorrupt and pure," she, using its langnage, doth so in its meaning also, and asserts her power of absolution in the same sense as he whom she calls "the holy[v] father," "the[w] holy Martyr of God, St. Cyprian," who, from our Lord's own words,[x] thus infers, "The power then of remitting sins was given to the Apostles and to the Churches which they, sent by Christ, established, and to the Bishops who succeeded to them by vicarious ordination;" or in briefer words and yet earlier times, by St. Cyprian's master,[y] "Confession shall quench to them the fires of hell."

[u] Homily against Peril of Idolatry, Serm. 3. add Serm. 2. twice.

[v] Hom. of Alms deeds.

[w] Hom. of Repentance, Serm. 3.

[x] "Again in the Gospel, when Christ breathed on the Apostles only saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit, &c' The power then of remitting sins, &c. (Ep. 75. §. 17. p. 279. Oxf. Tr.) St. Cyprian is proving that "remission of sins can be given" in the Church only, not "in the synagogues of heretics." add Ep. 73. §. 7. p. 247.

[y] Tertull. de Pœnit. §. 12. p. 368. Oxf. Tr. "If thou drawest back from Con-

We may then (whether priests or penitents or both in one) have full comfort that the Church of England has denied or abridged nothing of that "ministry of reconciliation" which God has committed to His Church. Not to constrain Confession, is not to deny it; to leave it to the penitent's choice, is not to refuse it, if chosen; we are not set free one way, to be limited in the other; freed from the necessity of confession, to be denied, if we crave it, the comforts of special absolution—a freedom more like that denounced by the prophet, "Behold,[z] I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, to the famine," than to that "liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." The Church leaves us free, yet fails not to remind us of the responsibilities which that very freedom entails upon us. A reverent, tender, mind may well pause, ere he attempt to abridge, either way, that freedom, or call in question that use of the keys, which as it hath never been laid aside, but rather advocated at all times by Bishops[a] and Divines of note,

fession," [exomologesis, the whole course of the prescribed penitence, ending in absolution,] "consider in thine heart that hell-fire which confession shall quench for thee, and first imagine to thyself the greatness of the punishment, that thou mayest not doubt concerning the adoption of the remedy.'' Comp. Abp. Bramhall, pt. iv. Disc. 7. t. v. p. 222. Oxf. Ed. "By a little shame which we suffer before our fellow-servant, we prevent that great confusion of face, which otherwise must fall upon impenitent sinners at the Day of Judgment."

[z] Jer. xxxiv. 17.

[a] See in Mr. Wordsworth's Appendix to a Sermon on Evangelical Repentance. The writers from which extracts are there given, are not from one section of the Church. Bp. Morton and Bp. White and Archbishop Ussher speak distinctly, as well as Bp. Overall and Abp. Bramhall and Bp. Taylor. Add Bp. Cosin, who in the "points of agreement with the Church of Rome" (in Hickes' Letters, t. i. App.) sets down, "In public or private absolution of penitent sinners;" and Dean Comber ad loc. more at large.

and recognised by our Canons [b], so now has it been and is resorted to by thousands in these later years, not exhorted thereto by man, but impelled and constrained by God's voice within the conscience, to seek therein, as they have found, pardon, and grace, and

[b] The extent of the practice of old is evinced by the Canon on the subject Can. 113. of our present Canons (A. 1603.), in permitting Ministers to join in presentments, except the case of confession. But Canons are not made, except with reference to existing practice. Its words are; "Provided always, that if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him; we do not any way bind the said Minister, by this our Constitution, but do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secresy, (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same,) under pain of irregularity." [Dr. Heylyn subjoins, Theol. Vet. (on the Creed,) p. 486. "And *pœna irregularitatis*, as the Canonists tell us, not only doth deprive a man of all his spiritual promotions for the present time, but makes him utterly uncapable of any for the time to come; and therefore is the greatest penalty, except degradation from his priesthood, which possibly a clergyman can be subject to." He adds also, that the same exception, here allowed, was made also "in the readmission of the Jesuits into the University of Paris." (Contin. of the Fr. Hist. p. 30.)] Bp. Overall accordingly in his Visitation Articles 1619, (Art. 21.) enquired: "Whether doth your Minister before the several times of the administration of the Lord's Supper, admonish and exhort his parishioners, if they have their consciences troubled and disquieted, to resort unto him, or some other learned Minister, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved, and by the Minister he may receive the benefit of absolution, to the quiet of his conscience, and avoiding of scruple. And if any man confess his secret and hidden sins, being sick or whole, to the Minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and receiving such spiritual consolation, doth or hath the said Minister at any time, revealed and made known to any person whomsoever, any crime or offence so committed to his trust, contrary to the 113th Canon?" (in Heylyn l. c. and more fully in Bp. Montagu, "Answer to late Gagger of Protestants," c. 12.) Bp. Montague subjoins in answer to his R. C. opponent, "Which is not like the injunction of those that hold, 'We *must* confess our sins but only unto God.'" Heylyn further says: "It was made one of the enquiries in the Book of Articles established in the Convocation of the year 1640, for a perpetual rule and standard in all episcopal and archidiaconal visitations, (Canon 9.) and proposed thus to the Churchwardens, viz. "Have you ever heard that your said Priest or Mi-

peace. Rather we may well implore persons, in the Name of "the God of peace," herein to follow the charitable counsel of our first English Liturgy[c], "requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to

nister hath revealed and made known at any time to any person whatsoever any crime or offence committed to his trust and secresy, either in extremity of sickness, *or in any other case whatsoever*, (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this land, &c.) declare the name of the offender, when and by whom you heard the same." (Article of Peril, c. 2. n. 25.)

A few years only after the Visitation Articles of Bp. Overall, are those of Bp. Andrewes, (Winchester A.D. 1625.) and Bp. Cosin (then Archdeacon of York) A.D. 1627. They are almost verbally the same as those of Bp Overall. Bp. Andrewes omits the words "by the ministry of God's holy Word" and "together with ghostly advice and counsel." Bp. Cosin adds in explanation, "if they have consciences troubled and unquieted *with sin*," and speaks, in the sequel, of "confession and absolution." The whole passage stands thus, "26. Doth he (as by the Communion-book he is bound to do) admonish and exhort them, that, if they have consciences troubled and unquieted with sin, they should resort unto him, or some other learned minister, from whom, upon opening their grief unto him, they may receive such ghostly counsel and comfort [in the margin, "if cause be, by confession and absolution"] as their consciences may thereby be relieved, and themselves receive the benefit of absolution, to the quieting their minds, and the avoiding of all scruple or doubt?

"27. And if any man, *at that or any other time*, being *sick or whole*, wish to confess his secret and hidden sins to the priest, for the unburthening of his conscience, &c." So then, shortly after the Canon of 1603, enjoining Ministers, under heavy penalty, not to reveal what was disclosed to them in confession, we have Visitation Articles in three different Dioceses, enquiring whether Ministers moved their people to confession, if their cases required it, or whether any were known to have betrayed what was so confided to him. All three also speak of this confession being made by persons "whether sick or whole," and Bp. Cosin adds "at that" (before the Holy Communion) or any other time." All this implies a real, living, system of Confession and Absolution in the Church.

In his devotions, Bp. Cosin enumerates among "the precepts of the Church," 5) "To receive the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ with frequent devotion. and three times a year at least, of which time Easter to be always one. And the better preparation thereunto, as occasion is, to disburthen and quiet our consciences of those sins that may grieve us, or scruples that may trouble us, to a learned or discreet priest, and from him to receive advice, and the benefit of absolution."

[c] Second Exhortation, p. 278. ed. Cardwell.

their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest, nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church, but in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every one to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences, whereas he hath no warrant of God's word to the same." Would that in these days of trouble and sorrow, we could more and more lay to heart this loving counsel, "judging nothing before the time," "judging not Another's servant," but each labouring, with what wisdom God gives to each, to save some, with himself, out of a perishing world!

But does, then, in effect, this solemn act of Absolution come to the same as that unearnest modern way in which persons, with some slight acknowledgment of the frailty of their nature, virtually absolve themselves? or does frequent absolution, like man's ordinary easy self-forgiveness, encourage relaxed ways? "If God bids man often repent," said the Novatian, "He allows him often to sin." "Perchance," (is part of the answer of S. Pacian [d],) "I might allow this, if luxury were accounted penitence, on which such toil is imposed, the destruction of the flesh enjoined, continual tears, unending groans." And therefore the Church of England, wherever, in her Liturgy,

[d] Ep. iii. 21.

she speaks of repentance, is careful to speak also of "true [e]," "earnest," "unfeigned," "faithful," "hearty," "worthy," repentance, nor ever names it without some word to express its reality; well knowing how easily and how fatally we might mistake for it a false repentance, itself to be repented of, everlastingly, but hopelessly. David said, "I have sinned," and the Prophet said, "Therefore hath the Lord put away thy sin." Saul said, "I have sinned," but the Prophet answered, "Thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel." Judas said, "I have sinned," and went and hanged himself. All confessed alike; but Saul had no humility, Judas no hope [f]. "What availeth," saith S. Gregory the Great, "to confess wickedness, if the affliction of penitence follow not the voice of Confession? For in every one truly penitent, three things are to be

[e] "*true repentance*" (twice in the daily Absolution, thrice in the Visitation of the Sick) being omitted in the prayers for "persons troubled in mind or in conscience," "add *seriousness* to his *repentance*," (Visitation of the Sick,) "*unfeigned repentance*," (ib.) "*earnest and true repentance*," (Commination Service,) "*faithful repentance*," (ib.) "*with all contrition*," (ib.) "if with a *true penitent* heart, we—for *then* we, &c." (Service for H. Communion,) "*repent you truly*," (ib.) "ye that do *truly and earnestly repent* you," "who with *hearty repentance* and true faith," (ib.) "all that *truly* turn to Him," (ib.) *worthily lamenting* our sins," (Collect for Ashwed.)

[f] "Let no man, dearest, propose to himself this sort of penitence [that for graver sins,] let no one prepare himself for this; yet if it should be, let no one despair. Judas the traitor, not so much the wickedness he committed as despair of forgiveness, caused to perish utterly. He was not worthy of mercy, therefore no light shone in his heart, that he should run speedily to His mercy Whom he had betrayed, as did they who had crucified Him; but despairing he killed himself, he hung, he suffocated himself.—What he did in his body, that had taken place in his soul. They who despair of the forgiveness of God, by their very despair suffocate themselves within, so that the Holy Spirit cannot visit them." S. Aug. Serm. 352. de Pœnit. ii. 8. So also S. Chrys.

considered, the conversion of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the revenge on sin[g]." And all these have, in hope, exceeding sweetness, sweeter far then all the destructive pleasure for which men sell their souls; yet all have deep, searching, pain.

It is mostly through searching pain, some stunning blow or sharp piercing stroke without, or strong inward mental fear and agony, that the sinner is deadened to the world, and made alive to God. Suspended life cannot flow again without deep pain. "No one," says St. Augustine[h], "chooseth a new life, but who repenteth him of the old." "Man must long to become what he hath *not* been, hate what he *hath* been." What is repentance, but, out of love to God, to will from the heart all undone which has offended Him, with strong purpose never more to offend Him? Yet we cannot wish undone, what we do not hate; and so the first dealing of God with the soul mostly is, to make it condemn itself, to place itself before the sinner's face, bring before him all which he had hitherto striven to put behind his back and hide from himself, and by a lightning-flash to pierce his darkness and

[g] S. Gregory ad loc. "He sheweth the quality of his confession, in that he added, 'But now honour me before the elders of my people, and before Israel.' It is clear what sort of penitence he hath, who still desires to be honoured. For had he been truly penitent for his sin, he would have desired to be dishonoured rather than honoured. Well may we marvel at the hardness of a rejected heart. When the Man of God, executing the command of the Creator said, 'The Lord hath rejected thee from being king,' he, on the contrary, who receiveth the sentence of rejection, through desire of eminence seeketh honour. What is then that he saith, 'I have sinned?' On confession of sin, there should follow, not honour or glory, but vileness and contempt. For what availeth, &c." (as in text.) L. vi. in 1 Reg. c. 2. §. 33.

[h] l. c. §. 2.

shew him the pit of hell which yawns beneath his feet. "If we would judge ourselves," says Holy Scripture, "we should not be judged[i]." Yet "judge ourselves" not with a slight superficial judgment, "after the manner of dissemblers with God," but by a strict, searching, thorough, judgment, as far as man is capable; (διεκρίνομεν,) not judging only, but sifting himself through and through; acts, motives, and circumstances; the aggravations of his sins, and their endurance; the light against which he sinned, the checks of conscience, or the motions of God's Holy Spirit; the scandal to others, or the peril of others' souls, which he hath injured, but which he cannot restore. Strict must that judgment be, which is to forestall and turn aside the Judgment of God. Hitherto the sinner had hidden, like Adam, his sin; he had invented excuses, he had silenced or stifled or drugged his conscience, rebuked it when it would speak, laid his sin to outward circumstances, to error perhaps in others, to some neglect or mistake in his education, or to some failure of the Church; or he had ascribed it to the frailty or powerlessness of nature, to the strength of temptation and the impossibility of resisting it, in other words he had cast the blame of his sin upon God Himself, the Author of that nature, and the Disposer of all the accidents of our lives. And now he

[i] "He does not [here] say, 'if we punished ourselves,' 'if we were revenged on ourselves,' but only if we would acknowledge our offence, pass sentence on ourselves, condemn the things done amiss, we should escape the punishment both in this world and the next. For he that condemns himself, propitiates God in two ways, both by acknowledging his sins, and by being more on his guard for the future." S. Chrys. ad loc.

must be to himself in God's stead, and judge himself as God would judge him. He has hitherto been his own advocate to plead for himself; now he must be his own judge, to condemn himself. And what sort of judge? Even, as far as he can attain, like Him Who "trieth the very heart and reins," Who discerneth the thoughts and intents of the heart, before Whose Eyes all is naked, Who shall bring every secret thing into judgment, good or bad; Him Whom Holy Scripture calls, "*The* Judge," "The Righteous," "The Just, Judge," "a Mighty and a Terrible, Which regardeth not persons nor taketh rewards [k]," that Judge, "Who hateth them that work iniquity" and "will by no means spare the guilty," in Whose "judgment the ungodly cannot stand." It is the majesty of human law, that the judge is the Minister of God; "he beareth not the sword in vain;" his sentence, when just, is a sort of "type and earnest of the great Judgment-seat." What, when the judge has to enter into that inward court, where God Himself resides, where He has often spoken, warned, pleaded, but in vain, against the deed, ere it was committed, and now still writes His sentence there, if we will read it! "If our heart condemn us," says Holy Scripture, "God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God." Every pang of the heart is a witness on behalf of God against the sinner. It is His sentence bound up in the soul itself, there to remain for

[k] Deut. x. 17.

ever, unless He Who wrote it there, Himself efface it. And now, in that awful silence of the soul, himself with himself, where no eye can reach except his own and God's, with no patron, no plea, no friend, he has to open that fearful book, wherein all the evil he has ever done is written, retrace the faded characters of forgotten sin, revive what he had well-nigh blotted from his own memory, and again and again pronounce "Guilty" against himself, knowing that it is himself whom he is sentencing, himself whom he is pronouncing worthy of eternal woe. All pleas for his sin must fall off, like scales from his eyes, as they will before the Eye of God. He must stand, as it were, aloof from himself, and, quickened by God's Holy Spirit, behold with stedfast gaze, himself, as God beholdeth him, in all the deformity and vileness of his sins. "Let man," says an old writer on this place[1], "ascend the judgment-seat of his soul against himself, let him place himself before his face, and when in his heart the judgment is set, let memory stand forth the accuser, and conscience the witness, and fear the executioner. So shall the blood, as it were, of the confessing soul flow forth in tears. Be there before his eyes an image of the Judgment to come, and whatsoever he shall see in himself, which can be sentenced and punished by Him Who shall come to be our Judge, let him now in himself condemn and punish." It is an aweful office, to stand in God's stead; it is an awe-

[1] Comm. in S. Paul, Epp. ascribed to S. Anselm. Cave says they belong to Herveus Dolensis, A. 1130. but this passage is quoted as S. Augustine's by Pet. Lombard, A. 1140.

ful, dreadful sight, for a sinner to see himself. All, all his folly [m], unthankfulness, hardness of heart, contempt; all, in thought, word, and deed, against God, his neighbour, or his own body; all of childhood, youth, or ripening years; secret or manifest; sins of his own or occasioned to others; his besetting, repeated, sins, or sins from very wantonness, without temptation, which he drew, as it were, on himself,—well might the sinner shrink, as he does, from such a sight as this, unless the sentence stood, "judge thyself, that thou be not judged of the Lord." Yet the knowledge of the sin in itself were, as yet, as nothing. Heathen have seen their sins, and known them to be hateful, and acted them anew. He must behold them, as God sees them, not as sins only, but as a Christian's sins. What has not the fallen Christian done, against Whom has he sinned, what has he forfeited? Misery enough it is, to sit in darkness, to be cold to heavenly things, to know not the sweetness of intercourse with God; but what intenser misery to have blinded, chilled, deafened a man's own soul, that he cannot "know" his Saviour's "Voice." Misery enough is the bondage of Satan, the iron rule of custom, whereby man's sins are multiplied against his will, when sin added to sin are, S. Augustine [n] says, "the links of that hard chain, which hold the soul enthralled against its will." But heavier is it yet, to pronounce against thyself that it is "deservedly; since

[m] Bishop Andrewes, Latin Devotions in his deep "confession of sin," p. 301—320. ed. Hall.

[n] Conf. viii. 5, 6.

willingly" the soul forged these fetters for itself, and for "the glorious liberty of the sons of God," chose the hard bondage and the toil in the miry clay from which it had been freed. Misery is it, for the soul to feel wholly a wreck of itself; what, itself to have made that wreck! What was it, as new born it arose in the brightness of baptismal purity? Fairer far, and more glorious, than when it was first created, brighter than "the sun when he goeth forth in his might," since it was clothed with Christ, and the Eyes of God rested with love upon it, as bearing on it the likeness of His Well-beloved Son, and the Holy Trinity chose it, as a sanctuary wherein to dwell, "There will I rest, for I have a delight therein." Nay more still, the depths of Heaven stood open to it; "no good thing will He withhold from him that leadeth a godly life." No, not Himself, by Whose grace he leads it. He giveth grace for grace; each grace well-used expands the soul to receive more grace, and the enlarged soul containeth more of God, and God filling the soul enlarges it, and enlarging, fills it. No bound is there to the growth in grace and love but that which is boundless, "the measure of the stature of the Fulness of Christ." No order, it seems, of the Heavenly Hierarchy, but lost of its host in the fall of the Apostate Angels.[o] No order, it is believed, but is to be filled out of that humanity, which God the Son, by taking

[o] Satan himself is called a Cherub, (Ezek. xxviii. 16.) there are also "Angels," "Principalities," "Authorities," "Powers," ἄρχαι, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις, among the evil spirits, Rom. viii. 38. Eph. vi. 12. Col. ii. 15. as among good, Eph. iii. 10. Col. ii. 10. 1 Pet. iii. 22.

it, hath deified [p]. Such might it have been! What is it now? Holy penitents [q] have heaped together all the most loathsome objects, from which the eye turns sickened, to form some faint image of the loathsomeness of their own soul when leprous from sin. Yet all imaginable loathsomeness gathered in one, were no shadow of that act, whereby unclean spirits dwell in the temple of God, and man, the image of God, receives in him, nay becomes the image of the Evil one. "By sin," says a holy man [r], "man becomes alien from God, a destroyer of himself, a child of hell, a mansion of confusion, a slave of the devil, a scoffer of grace, a despiser of glory." And *for what?* It is thought that it will be one of the miseries of the damned, to know, that, when they might for a few years' toil and self-denial have had the bliss of heaven, they bartered it for that unutterable, endless woe; *and for what?* For what too many know, it would seem to defile this holy place to name; for what they cannot themselves bear to think of.

Such thoughts must the penitent soul have before it in its hours of misery; its own decay, the intensity of its loss, the foulness of the deadly gain for which it sold itself, its forfeiture of the brightness of grace and of its glorious inheritance, the unutterable loathsomeness of each single sin! What when they are countless! "Thou, O Lord," says the great penitent [s]

[p] See S. Athan. c. Arian. ii. 21. p. 380. and not. p. Oxf. Tr.

[q] Here too, in part, our own Bp. Andrewes, (Morning Prayers,) "an unclean worm, a dead dog, *a putrid* corpse," "putredo et vermis," p. 300.

[r] S. Laur. Justin. de perf. grad. c. 1.

[s] S. Aug. Conf. viii. 7.

of the Christian Church, "Thou didst turn me round towards myself, taking me from behind my back where I had placed me, unwilling to observe myself, and setting me before my face, that I might see how foul I was, how crooked and defiled, bespotted and ulcerous. And I beheld and stood aghast; and whither to flee from myself I found not.—And if I sought to turn my eyes from off myself, Thou again didst set me over against myself, and thrustedst me before my eyes that I might find out my iniquity, to hate it."

Yet even this, although, of all sights, to the human soul the most unbearable, is as nothing still, compared to the thought, "against Whom have I done this," "Whom have I offended," "Whose gifts, alas!" "Whose Blood have I trampled under foot?" It is the very depth of human misery, and the very "mystery of iniquity," that a worm of earth can resist, offend, do despite to, such Majesty, such Goodness, Gentleness, and Love. It is a fearful power to be able to cast away the gift of Infinite Love; to set Almighty Power at defiance, yet itself below all creatures, over which He set us; to use all the senses which He gave, the whole body and soul, to rebellion against Him; to have entered into His very Sanctuary, and there, in His very Presence, to have marred His Image; perverted Reason, which is His Attribute and Effluence; used Freewill, to will what He willed not; defiled Memory, the image of God's Knowledge; warped Conscience, His Voice and Representative. Fearful is it to have abused and wasted His gifts of nature, of Provi-

dence, and of Grace; but to have profaned His Name in ourselves, to have wasted the price of His Blood, to have despised His Voice speaking within the sinner's self, to have, wilfully, not fled only from His Presence, but driven forth that Gracious Presence from the soul, and for Him Who is All-Good to have received in exchange Him Who is All-evil—well might the fathers call repentance a Baptism of tears; well might it draw forth tears of blood, and, were it possible, the blessed Angels weep over such a wreck as this, such misery undoing the work of so much mercy! The mere beholding of a man's own sin might produce remorse or despair; the thought of God's love against Whom he had so sinned, while it deepens the self-abhorrence, melts the sternness of self-hatred into penitential love.

But when the soul has thus judged and (as it must) condemned itself, will it be an idle sentence? Will it not be ready to avenge Him Whose sentence it has pronounced against itself? Will this heavy review of sins be a mere pageant, which shall last its hour, and issue in nothing? Shall a luxurious monarch have been ready to lay hands on himself, that he had killed his friend, "so great," says a heathen [t], "is the vehemence of repentance," and will the Christian penitent, who has gone forth guilty from the Judgment-seat of God and pronounced against itself in His Name, that he has "crucified the Son of God afresh," will he "say to his soul, Eat, drink, and be merry?" Not

[t] Cic. Tusc. iv. 37. quoted by Bishop Taylor on Repentance, iv. 6. §. 75.

so Holy Scripture, nor nobler souls, to whom God, with renewed life, has restored the sense whence they had fallen. "Revenge" is the last and summit of the goodly array of the workings of that "penitence, whereof," St. Paul says, "there shall be no repentance.[u]" They are not passing, but abiding fruits, lasting until, with them, the soul be gathered into the garner of the Lord; tears gathered into His bottle, which through the Blood of Christ shall at the Judgment-Day have been found to have washed away the foulest stains; seven-fold gifts to the penitent from God the Holy Ghost, to replace and restore the seven-fold gifts which he had lost. "Earnestness" opens the blessed train, dissipating all sluggishness and listlessness and security; then "acknowledgment[v] of its offence;" "indignation" with itself; "fear" of damnation, and of the loss of the sight of God, and of relapses into sins; "longing" for its lost graces and the light of His Countenance; "zeal" for His glory and for future growth in grace; and lastly "revenge," (ἐκδίκησις,) the very property of God.[w] "Vengeance[x] is Mine," Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, a word, no where in the New, and scarcely in the Old Testament, used but of the

[u] "For no one," says St. Chrysostome, "will find fault with himself, that he be grieved for his sin, that he mourn, and bruise himself." (ad loc. Hom. 15. §. 2.)

[v] ἀπολογία.

[w] In the New Testament, of the agency of God's instruments, Acts vii. 24. 1 Pet. ii. 14. in the LXX of human beings, without direct reference to God, only Jud. xv. 7; xvi. 29. (of Samson) Lam. iii. 59. Ezek. xxv. 15. (of the heathen, in contrast with the vengeance of God, vers. 14. 17.)

[x] Rom. xii. 19. Heb. x. 30. "God of Vengeance." (ἐκδικησέων,) Ps. xciii. 1. LXX.

vengeance of God, or that which is taken by the minister of His Justice, executing His sentence. "Vengeance" on himself, or "the fulfilment of the sentence of God," (ἐκδίκησις,) is the completion of the Judgment on himself, (διεκρίνομεν.) In the mercy of God, he was permitted to stand to himself in the place of God as Judge; in the mercy of God, he is permitted to be to himself as God, as the chastener of his sins, the executioner of his own sentence. "Every one who is a penitent," says that great penitent and doctor, S. Augustine[y], "and in penitence confesseth his sins, is angry with himself, and in a manner, by penitence avengeth in himself what displeaseth himself. For God hateth sin. If thou also hatest in thyself what God also hateth, thou art in a degree united in will to God, in that thou hatest in thyself what God also hateth. Exercise severity on thyself, that God may intercede for thee, and not condemn thee. For sin is certainly to be punished. This is due to sin, punishment, condemnation. Sin is to be punished either in thee or by thee. If it is punished by thee, then it will be punished without thee; but if it is not punished by thee, it will be punished with thee."

And this punishment, God's written law, within the conscience or without, in the consent of all mankind, or in His Providence, in His Word or in His Voice within the soul, should bear some proportion to the sin. Not (technically) to make satisfaction to the Justice of Almighty God, (for this, the Blood of His

[y] Serm. 29. fin. see other passages in Note K, on Tertullian. p. 376. Oxf. Tr.

Co-Equal Son Alone sufficed,) but as belonging to that penitence, which through That Blood shall be accepted. "A mighty wound," says S. Ambrose, [z] "needeth a deep and lengthened cure. A mighty wickedness needeth mighty amends." "Whoso [a] hath heaped up the offence, heap he up also the penitence. For mightier sins are washed away by mightier tears." For so says God by the great preacher of repentance, "Bring forth fruits (ἀξίους) worthy of repentance [b]." What doth repentance? It closeth the depths of hell, it opens the heights of heaven. It [c] places the sinner with the holy Angels, restores His lost creature to the Creator. All, even the slightest sin, is indeed worthy of more sorrow than we can feel for it; and the holy have wept more bitterly the infirmities from which our nature is not yet freed, than most of us, even deadly sin. Yet it were to apply the paradox of Stoical philosophy to Christian penitence, to say that because all sin is deeply offensive to Almighty God, the deepest sins need no deeper repentance than the slightest. To be fretted or to be angered is no such sin as to lie; to lie is not to commit adultery. All

[z] de vir. laps. c. 8. §. 36.

[a] de pœnit. i. 2. see others, l. c. p. 375.

[b] "It is one thing to bring forth 'fruits of penitence,' another, to bring forth 'fruits worthy of penitence.' For the fruit of good works ought not to be alike in him who has less, and him who has more, sinned, or in him who has fallen in no, or in some, or many grievous sins. By these words then, 'bring forth fruits worthy of repentance,' the conscience of each is cited, that one should seek so much the greater gain of good works through penitence, the greater losses he inflicted upon himself through sin." S. Greg. ad loc. Hom. 20. in Evang. §. 8.

[c] "Hæc est quæ homines ad Angelos ducit, et creaturam reddit Creatori.' de vera et falsa pœnit. init. ap. S. Aug. t. vi. App.

sin does not put man out of a state of grace; efface the image of God; invite "seven spirits more wicked than the first, to dwell" in the man; "defile," in that fearful way, "the temple of God;" "trample under foot the Son of God." And fruits which might be worthy of repentance of lesser sins, do not betoken the deep, humble, broken-hearted sorrow for the greatest, "which God will not despise." We do not sorrow for an acquaintance as for a parent, for a friend's sickness as for his death: no more then, for the sickness of the soul as for its death. But, saith St. Cyprian, "hapless [d] one, it is thine own soul thou hast lost; dead in spirit, thou hast begun to survive thyself, and, a living corpse, to carry about thee thine own death." If thou wouldest measure what fruits are worthy of thy repentance, weigh well the grievousness of thy sins, the blackness of thy ingratitude, the grace thou hast resisted and forfeited, the depths of hell from which, by God's mercy, it shall raise thee.

"Take heed to thyself," says S. Basil [d], "that in proportion to the fault thou admit also the restoration from the remedy. Great and grievous is the sin, thou hast need of much penitence, of bitter tears, of intense watching, of an unbroken fast. Is the offence light and bearable? Be the penitence also proportioned. Only take heed to thyself, that thou know thy mind's health and disease."

Yet herein, if any where, is the advice of a physi-

[d] de laps. §. 19. [e] Hom. in verba Attende tibi ipsi §. 5. t. 2. p. 19.

cian of the soul needed, lest, in the first fervour and bitterness of repentance, penitents use unwise means of that "chastening of the body," which S. Paul commended and practised; or lest, with weaker frames, they be unable to bear the austerities of the early Church; or with weaker wills they grow weary of severities which they have not yet obtained grace to bear, and give up altogether repentance and hopes of life.

Yet repentance, although its outward expressions may change, must be the same always; and even if we cannot come up to them, it is well to set before us the austere penitence of Holy Scripture and the early Church, in order to quicken our laggard steps to something which may be an earnest of our sorrow, and which may, by outward action, stamp the inward feeling more deeply into the soul. If we cannot[f], as S. Basil speaks, use "an unbroken fast," at least we may keep penitentially the fasts of the Church; we may use food as medicine for the daily decays of nature, not for luxury; we may cut off self-indulgence, not "fare sumptuously every day," but feed the poor of Christ. If we cannot use "intense watchings," at least, we may break off sloth, and be beforehand with the morning, to "cry unto the Lord our God," or

[f] So, again, Bp. Andrewes, (although the writer knew it not,) "If not all night, as CHRIST, yet for one hour. If not on the earth, if not in ashes, yet not on couches. If not in sackcloth, yet not in purple and fine linen. If not altogether from all, yet from pleasant morsels. If not, as Zaccheus, fourfold, yet, as is the law, (Lev. v. 16.) adding a fifth. If not as the rich, yet as the widow. If not half, yet the thirtieth. If not above my power, yet to my power." Latin Prayers, p. 334.

by night, the image of death may come over us, with penitential words[g] on our lips and in our heart. If a penitent cannot, with Ahab and the penitents of Holy Scripture, gird haircloth around his loins, at least he need not "wear soft clothing and live delicately;" he can pray God to gird him with continence, and "cut off from himself things lawful as he remembereth that he committed things unlawful[h]." If we may not with the Publican, "smite on the breast," at least, we may seek the intense inward humiliation of the Publican; may love to be "abased" rather than to be "exalted;" take reproach gladly, shun and dread respect and praise; be the last, outwardly, when we can, and, inwardly, ever. If we may not with S. Paul "bruise the body," we may by God's grace break in pieces our own self-will. [Penitents of old scourged the body, in adoring thought of Him by Whose stripes we were healed; *we* may at least, with S. Augustine[i], "lash our souls with scourges of condemnation that they may follow us, striving to go after God."] If we cannot lie in dust and ashes, at least we may in contrition of heart, own ourselves to be "dust and ashes." If duty forbids our retiring from the world, with S. Jerome, at least, from time to time, we may, with

[g] As one of our Bishops fell asleep, night by night, saying the 51st Psalm.

[h] Si quis in fornicationem, vel fortasse, quod est gravius, in adulterium lapsus est, tanto a se licita debet adscindere, quanto se meminit et illicita perpetrasse. S. Greg. in Ev. l. c.

[i] Conf. viii. 7. §. 18. The passage was omitted in delivery, inasmuch as the very mention must suggest a practice which may be very humbling and hallowed, if done in memory of "The Scourging," but in which penitents should not judge for themselves.

Jeremiah, "sit alone because of Thy Hand[j]," "sit alone and keep silence[k], bearing the yoke upon us;" we "may put our mouth in the dust, if so be there may be hope." If we may not use austerities which wear the body, at least we may long, with S. Paul, "to spend and to be spent;" we may lawfully wear ourselves in body and mind for the souls and bodies of our brethren. The punitive measures of the Ancient Church were in part to chastise the flesh which sinned, in part, as the natural accompaniments of sorrow. "If one member of the body is afflicted, all the rest suffer with it." "And if," adds Bp. Taylor[l], "the heart be troubled, he that is gay in any other part, goes about to lessen his trouble; and that takes off, it does not promote, repentance." We make all outward things to harmonize with deep human sorrow; are we sincere, if we heap around ourselves everything out of harmony with Divine? True "sadness" of heart, whereby it "is made better," heart-broken sorrow for having offended God, is itself the truest, deepest, penance; whatever besides, the Ancient Church recommended to aid it, this, as it is the end of all, so is it every where, in every form, enforced as the very chiefest amends to God.[m] Let any obtain it in what way he can, it is a great gift of God;

[j] Jer. xv. 17. [k] Lam. iii. 28, 29.

[l] On Repentance, c. x. sect. vi. on Ecclesiastical Penance, or the Fruits of Repentance.

[m] e. g. "tears which make amends to God," satisfacientibus Deo fletibus. St. Cyprian. (Ep. 31. §. 8. see on Tertull. l. c. p. 371 sqq.) Bp. Taylor l. c. §. 74. "Sorrow and mourning," §. 80. "prayers."

let any in any way obtain deep sorrow of heart out of hatred of his sin and love for his Redeemer, and he will fulfil the conditions and bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.

Advent, like penitence itself, has a mingled character of sorrow, and awe, and hope, and joy: sorrow for sin and wasted grace: awe at judgment to come; yet hope and joy too, that He Who "shall come to be our Judge," at this time, "to deliver man, abhorred not the Virgin's womb." Our own Liturgy, in every change which was made, brings before us the stricter side,[n] as if to say, "sow in tears," that ye may "reap in joy." Earnestness in Advent is the harbinger of Christmas joy; the Baptist's preaching of repentance prepares the heart to hear the song of Angel-Choirs; first we hear "Glory to God," then "on earth peace, good-will towards men." Awe of the Day of Judgment must make us fill up the low places of our earthliness, and lower the eminences of our pride, make straight our crooked ways, and soften our asperities and all contrary to love, if we would, in the end, "see the Salvation of our God."

Nature itself dictates, at the closing year, to make up our account with God; conscience feels an awe at this yearly image of the close of all things; the Church brings Judgment before us; grace ever says in our inmost hearts, "*now* is the accepted time." Well were it then, my younger brethren, now, if ye never have before, to set before you the Day of days;

[n] See Pref. to Avrillon Guide for Advent, p. xxviii. sqq.

when the earth and all that is therein, its pomps, its vanities, its desires, all which would now draw away your souls from God, shall be burned up, and nothing shall remain but what can abide the searching fire of God's judgment. Set before you that dread Judgment-seat, where they who have not before sued for mercy, shall find none; imagine every thought, word, or deed of shame, all which thou now wouldest hide from thyself, brought to light before the whole company of heaven and earth; set before your eyes, with our own holy penitent [o], "the Just Judge; excuse unavailing; proof unanswerable; punishment inexorable; hell unending; Angels unpitying; the yawning pit; the sweeping stream of fire; fire unquenchable; the prison-house dark; the rayless darkness; the bed of living coals; the worm unsleeping; the chains indissoluble; the bottomless abyss; the wall impassable; the wailing unpitied;" behold thyself there, trembling, ashamed; all without, terror; conscience within, gnawing; unable to hide thyself or to appear; thy own darkness more intolerable in that light; Heaven, too late longed for, and fading away; the Face and the love of God lost for ever; the misery of devils thy portion for ever; "none to stand by thee, none to plead for thee, none to deliver thee," and so "judge thyself, that thou be not judged of the Lord;" so, while there is yet time, say with that same pious penitent, "I repent, O Lord, I repent; help Thou my

[o] Bp. Andrewes. Meditation I. (p. 234. ed. Hall.) It is thought to have been his midnight prayer.

unrepentance, and more and yet more, pierce, rend, bruise my heart."

And when thou hast judged and condemned and humbled thyself, then seek how thou mayest compensate past evils by future good; past neglect by future zeal. Shew that thou prizest thine own soul, which thou hadst forfeited and God restores to thee, which thou hadst defiled, and God anew cleanseth, by thy love for the souls of thy brethren. God can overrule to good even past evil. Penitents have ever been among His chosen vessels. When a chief Apostle had denied Him in the judgment hall, a penitent confessed Him, even on the Cross; and "before [p] Apostles" was translated from his cross to Paradise, the first-fruits of our redeemed race. When Apostles fled, a penitent, with His Virgin Mother and beloved Disciple, amid the scoffs of an unbelieving world, stood beneath His Cross. The chiefest of the Apostles were chief in penitence. He to whom first were given "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," on whose confession the Church was built, the chosen instrument to bring both Jew and Gentile converts into the fold, of all had fallen deepest, and wept most bitterly; and it is thought, morning by morning, his whole life long, wept his fall. He who was caught into the third Heaven, "in labours more abundant, in deaths oft," "not a whit behind the chiefest Apostles," owns himself most lowlily, "the chief of sinners," "an abortive birth[q]." The "man after God's own heart"

[p] S. Chrys. Hom. 7. in Gen. §. 4.

[q] 1 Cor. xv. 18.

even now perhaps wins more souls to God by his deep penitence, than by the noble faith wherein he slew the Philistine, or his long-tried unwearied trust in God. The deep tones of sorrow wherein he poured out his soul to God have been the voice of every later penitent whom God has recalled, the parting words of Saints [r] within sight of Paradise. In later times the chief Doctor of our Western Church had been its most signal penitent. Penitence was the garb of the mighty Prophet, who was caught up in the chariot of fire, who knew not death; the image of the Ascension of our Lord: it was the life of him, who came "in the spirit and power of Elias," the great Forerunner, sanctified from his mother's womb, who before his birth foretold the coming of his Lord. He who was first Bishop of Jerusalem, and sat first in the Apostolic Council, whom Jews and Christians alike entitled James the Just, led a life of austerest penitence.[s] "The two witnesses[t]," who shall have power given them in heaven and earth, uniting the mighty deeds of those

[r] "He" [St. Augustine] "had been wont to say to us, in familiar converse, that, after Baptism received, even esteemed Christians and priests ought not to part out of the body without worthy and competent penitence. Which he himself also did in the last sickness, whereof he deceased. For he had directed that those very few Psalms of David on penitence [the seven penitential Psalms] should be written out for him, and placed against the wall. These leaves, as he lay in the bed, he stedfastly gazed upon and read during the days of his sickness, and wept largely and continually. And lest his attention should be distracted by any one, about ten days before he departed from the body, he asked of us who were present, that no one should come in to him, except just when the physicians came to look at him, or refreshment was brought him. This was observed and done; and all that time he gave himself to prayer." Life by Possidius, c. 31.

[s] Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. H. E. ii. 23.

[t] Rev. xi. 3—12.

who were seen with our Lord in His glory, who, like Elijah, "shall have power to shut heaven that it rain not in the days of their prophecy," and, like Moses, shall "have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues" (not once only as in Egypt, but) "as often as they will;" who shall be likened to their Lord in His Resurrection and Ascension, shall through their whole time of prophecy wear the garb of penitence.[u]

So would God teach us how precious is penitence in His sight. The beginning of the Christian life, it accompanies it to the end. The groundwork of conversion, the companion of faith, the enlargement of love, the soothing fosterer of hope, the condition of holiness; it leads to the mercies of Christ, it opens all the treasures of the love of God. It restores from the lowest depths of sin; it increases with all real growth in grace; it is intensest in those in whom grace hath most wrought its work. Penitent thyself, thou shalt learn to speak to the hearts of penitents. Thou knowest too well the wounds which enter the soul; thou wilt know the healing wherewith the Great Phy-

[u] "Clothed in sackcloth." The σάκκος was "haircloth," (Zech. xiii. 4. 2 Kings i. 8. Matt. iii. 4. Jos. B. Jud. i. 17.) it was the prophet's garb, so that even false prophets were compelled to assume it. (Zech. l. c.) see also Is. xxx. 2. "Holy preachers are hard, because they speak not soft things to sinners; they are also hard, because, that they may amend others soundly, they shew, in their own converse, the hardnesses which they recommend. For hard did he seem who reproved the Jews, saying, 'O generation of vipers, who &c. Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.' But he who was hard to others was not relaxed to himself. For, to shew that he held to the hardness of penitence which he taught, the Evangelist said, 'He had raiment of camel's hair &c.'" S. Greg. in 1 Reg. c. v. §. 20.

sician shall have healed thee. Thou knowest the sorrows and plague of thine own heart; thou wilt know the comfort, wherewith thou shalt be comforted of God. Earnestness, indignation, fear, longing, zeal, revenge, are the Apostolic tokens of penitence, and, by the Apostle's mouth, won the admiration of God Himself (ποσὴν). These must first burn within, then without; first, consume self as an offering to God, then burst abroad in the burning longing for His glory; first, His "Spirit of burning" within, then that "fire upon the earth," which He would have "kindled." So alone can the children of the Church, scattered in the colonies without a shepherd, be gathered into the fold of Christ; so alone can the bitter waters of infidelity and barbarism and heathenish sin, pent up in our cities, be sweetened by the Cross of Christ. So, alone, can we "prepare the way of the Lord, and make straight in the desert a highway for our God." The grace of thy God to thee shall not have been received in vain, but shall overflow to the salvation of those for whom, with thee, Christ died. "God Who made the light to shine out of darkness," when He hath "shined in thy heart," shall let His light in thee or thy light in Him, so "shine before men," in the "good works" which He shall work in thee, that they shall "glorify thy Father which is in heaven[x]." Sorrow for thy sins shall be to thee the Baptism of tears; to consume thine years "in labours, more abundant" for Christ's sake, "that where sin abounded, grace may

[x] 2. Cor. iv. 6. S. Matt. v. 16.

much more abound," has a portion of the Martyr's Baptism of blood. "If," says an early Bishop and Martyr[y], "if any move Him by his own amends, if by due entreaties, he appease His wrath and the displeasure of His indignation, He too will again give arms to the conquered, renew and strengthen his power, quicken his recovered faith. The soldier shall renew his warfare, enter the battle, challenge the foe, wrought by his very pangs more valiant for the fight. Who shall have thus made amends to God, who by penitence for his deeds, by shame for his sin, shall, from the very grief for his fall, have gained more of virtue and of faith, he, heard and holpen by the Lord, shall gladden the Church which he lately saddened, and now shall obtain of God not pardon only, but a crown."

To which He, of His Infinite mercy, bring us sinners, Who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, One God, for ever and ever. Amen.

[y] St Cyprian de laps. fin.

Thanks be to God.

Note A, *page* 9.

The original of the passages of S. Ambrose is "Remittuntur peccata per Dei verbum, cujus levites interpres et quidam executor est: remittuntur etiam per officium sacerdotis, sacrumque ministerium." The contrast in the two sentences seems to be much the same as in the other places, before quoted, between the authority of God and the ministry of man. Elsewhere, he says, "Sins are forgiven by the Holy Ghost, but men supply their *ministry* (ministerium) yet do not exercise the right of any power (jus alicujus potestatis), for they do not forgive sins in their own, but in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. They pray, God giveth; the service (obsequium) is through man, the richness of the gift (munificentia) is from the Power on High." (de Sp. S. iii. 18. §. 137.) As there S. Ambrose contrasts the "right and power" and the "gift," on the part of God, with the "obsequium" and "ministerium," on the part of man, so here "per Dei verbum" as the authority, with the "executor" and "officium sacerdotis, sacrumque ministerium," as the agency employed. The Levite, (more ordinarily the Deacon,) is by S. Ambrose explained before to be the "Minister Dei." It is possible, indeed, that by "Dei verbum" S. Ambrose meant, not "the word," but "the Word of God," (as he had just said, §. 13, anima in qua habitat Dei Verbum,) and then "Remittuntur peccata per Dei Verbum" would be equivalent to what he says in the de Sp. S. "per Spiritum Sanctum peccata donantur." In this case the meaning would be "Sins are remitted by the Word of God, Whose minister and, as it were, executor the Levite is."

In this sense Gratian (de pœnit, dist. 1. c. 51. Verbum Dei) and P. Lombard (4. dist. 18.) seem to have understood it, (although they quote but little of the passage and that inaccurately, Verbum Dei dimittit peccata, and blend with it words from the De Sp. S.) The Benedictines take it of the word of God, as also does Bp. Jewel, (Def. of Apol. P. 2. p. 145.) although he does not consider the whole passage, breaking off in the middle, "Remittuntur peccata per verbum Dei, cujus Levites interpres.

The meaning of this passage of S. Ambrose is further illustrated by the well-known passage of S. Augustine, which Bp. Jewel also quotes, "'Now are ye clean through the word which I have spoken to you.' Why saith He not, Ye are clean through the Baptism wherewith ye have been baptised? Saving that in water also the word cleanseth? Take away the word, and what is water but water? The word is added to the element, and it becomes a Sacrament, which itself also is a sort of visible word." (in Joh. Tract. 80. §. 3. [a])

In the same sense S. Augustine defines "the Baptism of Christ," as "Baptism consecrated by the words of the Gospel," (de Bapt. c. Don. vi. §. 47.) and again, (ib.) "God is present with His own Gospel words, without which the Baptism of Christ cannot be consecrated, and Himself hallows His own Sacrament." As then Baptism has its efficacy, according to S. Augustine, not through any power of man, but through the words which Christ appointed, "In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," so also according to S. Ambrose, has Absolution *its* efficacy, not

[a] S. Augustine, in the context, blends with the word of consecration, the word as believed, (since without faith Baptism could avail nothing,) yet the consecrating power he ascribes to the words used at Baptism, just as S. Chrys. and the Greek fathers. "By what word?" "In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." See, further, Tracts on Holy Baptism, p. 198. ed. 4. and note F. Additional Notes Ed. 1.

through any right of man, but through the "word" of Christ's commission, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted." Man, in either case, is the minister only.

A third passage which Bp. Jewel and Bingham quote from S. Jerome does not relate to the subject of absolution of sins into which Christians fall, but to the forgiveness of sins through the first embracing of the Faith of Christ. The whole passage is a comment on Is. xiv. 15. "We *all* were bound and were held shut up in prison, to whom, being bound, the Saviour said 'Go forth,' and to those who were in darkness, 'Shew yourselves.' 'For the Lord looseth the bound.' Who, being freed by Him, return thanks, saying, 'Thou hast loosed my bonds.' For each 'is bound by the cords of his sins,' which cords and bonds, the Apostles too can loose, imitating their Master, Who had said to them, 'Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.' But the Apostles loose them by the word of God, and testimonies of Scriptures, and exhortation to virtues." This wider meaning of the words, (S. Matt. xviii.) including the first entrance into the Christian covenant, does not, of course, exclude the more special. S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Cyril Alex., S. Leo, unite remission by Baptism and Penitence, yet as distinct acts of the same Power. (See Sermon i. p. 32. n. s.)

Bp. Jewel himself, it should be said, denies the necessity only, not the lawfulness of, private confession, nor does he limit "the office of loosing" to "the preaching of the Gospel." He would restrain it to "open crimes," yet, in such cases, he believes that "the Minister doth, after the perfect amendment of such as, by their sins, had banished and *made themselves strangers from* the common fellowship, and *from the Body of Christ*, reconcile and *restore* them to the company and *Unity of the faithful*," Apol. 6. Dis. 2.) i. e. whereas they were before out of Christ, they are thereby restored to be "in Christ," the highest spiritual change which can be!

THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

A

SERMON,

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY,

IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST,

In Oxford,

ON THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY, 1853.

BY THE REV.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW; CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

Christ is my Food.
S. AMBROSE.

SOLD BY

JAMES PARKER & CO., OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

AND

RIVINGTONS,

LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

1871.

PREFACE.

My former Sermon,—"The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent,"—was misunderstood by some, because it was not controversial. My object in it was not to *teach* the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, but rather, assuming the doctrine of the Church of England to be identical (as I believe it to be) with that of the Fathers, to present that doctrine in one aspect as "a comfort to the penitent." To this end I dwelt, not on the doctrine of the Real Presence in itself, nor even on the mode in which "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," but on the exceeding greatness of the Gift which is thus conveyed to the soul. I wished to impress on the souls of my hearers the actualness and closeness of the union of man's soul with its Redeemer, and in Him with God, wrought through that sacrament. I wished to aid to lift up the hearts of true peni-

tents, by showing them what stores of Mercy and Divine love, and nearness to God in Christ, were yet open to them.

One object alone, or at least above all others, I had in view in the whole course of Sermons, of which this Sermon was a part, "the comfort of the penitent." I wished to set forth to the weary and broken-hearted, the comforts in store for those who in truth, not in word, were "grieved and wearied with the burden of their sins." To the penitent the special comfort of the Holy Eucharist is, that it is the Body and Blood of his Redeemer; "that his sinful body is made clean by His Body, and his soul washed through His most Precious Blood." This being so clearly embodied in the prayers of our Church, it never even occurred to me, until after the Sermon was preached, that any grave question could be raised upon it. I was prepared for the sort of objection which, for ten years, had been raised on the doctrine of Baptism, and on that ground, and in order (if it might be) to bring home to men's minds the unseemliness of angry and irreverent disputing on this, which our Saviour left "as the pledges of His love to our great and endless comfort," I made the appeal in the outset of my Sermon[1]. I suspected nothing, and so I scarcely guarded any thing. I thought that it must be

[1] "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," p. 3.

enough to state generally that I did, without inquiring or defining, believe that we received at once elements of this world and His very Body and Blood. I said, "We[2], if we are wise, shall never ask, *how* they can be elements of this world, and yet His very Body and Blood." Having said this, I imagined that the rest of my Sermon would be understood in the same sense. It never even came into my mind to apprehend, that language of the Fathers, which simply expresses the reality of the Gift, could be thought to contradict the Church of England, which asserts the same reality.

My object throughout that Sermon was to show how, through the Holy Eucharist, we have life from our living and loving Lord Himself, re-creation in Him, and the earnest of endless joy and bliss in Him. To this end, I selected passages from the Fathers which spoke most fervently of the closeness of the union with our Lord, which He vouchsafes thereby to bestow upon us. I wished altogether to avoid controversy, and not to risk distracting men's minds from the one object which I desired to bring before them, the greatness of our loving Saviour's gift to *them*, and His unspeakable goodness. Men's minds so easily go off upon controversy, that I thought it right to avoid what would raise it. In quoting, then, from the Fathers, I *did* purposely abstain from citing pas-

[2] Ib. p. 7.

sages which might bear one way or the other upon modern controversy. I alluded neither to those passages which spoke of the outward elements as figures or symbols, nor yet to the opposite class which might be supposed, at first sight, to favour a belief of a physical change. Had I been writing a treatise on the Holy Eucharist, and referred to the Fathers, it would, of course, have been necessary expressly to consider them. This could not be done in a Sermon, and, in whatever degree it had been attempted, it would have changed the subject of the Sermon from that which I had in view. It may then help to save hard judgment in another case, to notice that a writer in the "Dublin Review," while allowing that my Sermon was a fair representation of the teaching of the Fathers, up to a certain point (*i. e.* as he thought, as far as our Articles permitted), charged me with unfairness, for omitting what, as he thought, went beyond it. I simply did not quote what did not bear upon my immediate subject, and might have thrown the mind into a controversial frame, instead of that which I wished to cherish, one loving, grateful, and devotional.

The doctrine of the present Sermon is the same as that in the former. But in this Sermon I have dwelt on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in itself; and have, therefore, of necessity, spoken more distinctly on the objective Presence of our

Lord therein; and, on the other hand, I have stated grounds why I believe, with the Church of England, that this real and objective Presence does not involve any physical change in the natural elements, which are the veils and channels of our Lord's Unseen Presence.

It is, I believe, the explanation of the former Sermon which, had opportunity been allowed, I should have given ten years ago.

The dimensions of a sermon can only present a bare outline of the argument on a subject. I have, on account of the importance of the subject, and with the memory of my former condemnation, entered more into details than I should have otherwise thought advisable in the pulpit. The notes will indicate what I hope, if God will, to fill out in an Appendix[1].

In the mean while, I trust that it may, by God's grace, suggest some earnest and reverent thoughts to those, for whose souls' sake it was preached.

CHRIST CHURCH,
Easter, 1853.

[1] This became a separate work, which is now referred to in the Notes as "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," viz., "The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, from the Death of St. John the Evangelist to the 4th General Council." 1855.

A

SERMON,

&c.

1 Corinthians x. 16.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

The Holy Eucharist is plainly the closest union of man with God. Through the Incarnation God took our nature, took the Manhood into God. But although we had that unspeakable nearness to Himself, in that the Co-eternal Son, God *of* God, and God *with* God, took not the nature of Angels, but took the Manhood into God, this was a gift to our whole race. It was a gift which, by its very nature, must overflow to us individually; yet still it required a further act of God's condescension fully to apply it to each one of us. God the Word became Flesh. Yet hereby He was in His Human Nature one *with* us; we were not, as yet, made "one with Him."

We belonged to Him as His creatures. Unutterable was the love whereby, when man was fallen, He took part of all our miseries, except our sins and the sinfulness of our nature; and these, which

He could not take *to* Himself, He took *on* Himself: what *we* could not bear, He bare *for* us. But although we were thereby reconciled to God, as His creatures, we were not yet united to Him individually. We could not be united to Him, save by His communicating Himself to us. This He willed to do by indwelling in us through His Spirit; by making us, through the Sacrament of Baptism, members of His Son; by giving us, through the Holy Eucharist, not in any carnal way, but really and spiritually, the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Son, whereby "He dwelleth in us, and we in Him; He is one with us, and we with Him." Through these, He imparteth to us the life which He Himself is. He, the Life of the world, maketh those alive, in whom He is. This is the comfort of the penitent, the joy of the faithful, the Paradise of the holy, the Heaven of those whose conversation is in Heaven, the purity of those who long to be partakers of His holiness, the strengthening of man's heart, the renewal of the inward man, the fervour of Divine love, spiritual peace, kindled hope, assured faith, burning thankfulness,—that our Lord Jesus Christ, not in figure, but in reality, although a spiritual reality, does give Himself to us, does come to be in us.

But nearness to God has also an awful aspect. "Our God is a consuming fire." Your consciences, my younger brethren, can best tell you whether your souls are arrayed in the wedding-garment which

Christ gives, and which Christ requires in those who would approach to His Heavenly Feast, the wedding-garment of faith and love unfeigned, an upright and holy conversation, cleansed and made pure by the Blood of Christ; or whether, "grieving the Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed," and "not led by the Spirit of God," ye are now (God forbid that ye should remain so) "none of His." I speak not now of the present, but of the past. Ye yourselves best know, how far ye differ from that past. But no one at any time can have known in any great degree, what were the habits of a large portion of the young in this place, or even the very outward fact, how, when man required it, almost all received the Holy Communion; how few, when God only called, and the young were left to their own consciences,—none can have observed this, without greatly fearing, that if too few are present in the one case, too many are present in the other.

The Church requires as conditions; repentance, faith, charity, a loving memory of the Passion of our Lord, and a steadfast purpose to lead a new life. This you are to ascertain for yourselves, by examining yourselves. God bids you by St. Paul; He exhorts you by the Church; "Search and examine your own consciences, and that not lightly and after the manner of dissemblers with God, but so that ye may come holy and clean to such a Heavenly Feast." Would that one were not compelled to think that many sought rather to forget themselves, than to

examine themselves; to hide themselves from themselves; to put away their sins for a day or two, in order to resume them as before; as though the wedding-garment which God requires, might be laid aside, as soon as the Feast was over; or as if this unwilling abstinence of a few days from some besetting sin were the clothing of "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

I would then, once more, my younger brethren, set before you the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist on both sides. And this, both because some, looking for too much clearness in their intellectual conception of Divine mysteries, are tempted to undue speculation in defining the mode of the Sacred Presence of our Lord; and others, practically, can hardly be thought to believe any real Presence at all; else they would not approach, as they do, so unrepenting and so careless.

It *is* a temptation, to require too precise theories, to desire to be able to state clearly to the understanding, that which is beyond all understanding. Thus, it is a very common, although untrue[1], plea

[1] It is held as a truth of faith by Roman divines too, that no one who does not die in a state of grace can go to heaven, and that after this life there is no obtaining of greater grace. The Roman doctrine of Purgatory is simply, that temporal punishment for sin is there endured, in the proportion required by Divine Justice, but without any change in the soul, such as in this life is wrought by the Grace of God, amid the patient endurance of suffering for the love of God, or in penitential sorrow. I instanced this, because I have known persons desirous to believe

for the doctrine of Purgatory, that it seems to explain, how those many who pass from this life in a very imperfect state, apparently unfit for Heaven, may yet be saved. Again, one and the same mind will vacillate between the most stringent statements of the Unity of the Church, and the most latitudinarian, as being, severally, clear to the understanding. Again, people think that unity would be best secured, if there were one visible head of the Church; that the analogy of a kingdom would best be maintained by a visible King; and so, they argue as if unity were not enough provided for, as our Lord left His Church. Others, again, have imagined a conditional foreknowledge, in lieu of God's Omniscience, or a predestination to eternal woe, as evading, in opposite ways, the inextricable difficulty of admitting at once both man's free agency and the absolute knowledge of the All-wise God.

And so, as to the Holy Eucharist, men *can* conceive that the elements after consecration are only what they seem and what they were before, not the vehicle of an Unseen Presence; or, again, they *can* imagine that they are nothing but an outward show, and that the Body of Christ alone is present; they can forget either the Unseen Presence or the visible form, but they have difficulty in receiving the thought which the Church of England suggests in

the doctrine, as giving them better hope of being saved. On the Intermediate State, see my Eirenicon, P. iii., "Is healthful Re-union impossible?" pp. 96—120.

her words[2]: "Of the due receiving of the blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ *under* the form of bread and wine;" that the sacramental bread and wine "remain still in their very natural substances;" and yet that under these poor outward forms, "His creatures of bread and wine," "the faithful verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ."

And yet Holy Scripture, taken in its plainest meaning, affirms both that the outward elements remain, and still that there is the real Presence of the Body of Christ. And I may, in the outset, say, that when the Articles reject Transubstantiation, they themselves explain what they mean to reject, —a doctrine which "is repugnant to the plain words of Holy Scripture," *i.e.* those words in which our Lord and St. Paul speak of the natural substances as remaining. The Articles call it also "a doctrine which overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," in that the outward and visible part is supposed to have no real subsistence. They except against no

[2] "Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting, praying, alms-deeds, of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Saviour Christ, *of the due receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine:* against idleness, against gluttony and drunkenness, against covetousness, against envy, ire, and malice, with many other matters, as well fruitful as necessary to the edifying of Christian people, and the edifying of godly living. Amen."—*End of first Book of Homilies.* See on this formula, Dr. Pusey's "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Doctrine of the English Church," 1857, pp. 4—159.

statement which does not imply that the natural substances cease to be.

To remove, in the outset, a misconstruction likely to occur. It will be said, "If the Church of England teaches that the consecrated elements remain in their very natural substances, and yet that the Body and Blood of Christ are present under those outward forms of bread and wine, then we are pledged to what is called Consubstantiation." This is altogether a mistake. The very term Consubstantiation is a mere term of reproach used against the Lutherans by those who denied any Sacred Presence at all[3]. To say that our Lord's Body was "consubstantiated" with the bread, would be the blasphemy of saying that It was united with the bread into one common substance.

In the indivisible Unity of God, we adore the Consubstantial Word which is the Son. Our Blessed Lord in His Divine Nature is Consubstantial with the Father; in His Human Nature, Consubstantial with us, as we confess in the Creed: "God, of the Substance of the Father, Begotten before the worlds, and Man, of the Substance of His Mother, Born in the world." His Body is Consubstantial with ours, of one common substance. Consubstantiation or Impanation[4] would be but physical explanations of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. Such doctrines

[3] See Gerhard de S. Cœna, § 104. Buddeus (de S. Cœna, § 27, in Miscell. S. ii. 84) quotes Hospinian, Prol. Conc. Disc. p. 6.

[4] "Consubstantiation" would be the union of two substances

are said to have been held by one or two in the middle ages[5]. They are expressly denied by the Lutherans[6] to whom they are imputed, and are taught in none of their books. The strongest statement of the earliest Confession of Augsburg[7]—"Of the Supper of the Lord, it is taught that the very Body and Blood of Christ are verily present in the Lord's Supper, under the form of bread and wine, and are distributed, and taken in it,"—like that of our homilies, offers no physical explanation, but simply expresses the real unseen sacramental Presence under the outward visible form.

To receive literally, then, those words of our Lord, "This is My Body," does not necessarily imply

into one, as the Apollinarians and Eutychians said that the Divine and Human Natures of our Lord were consubstantial (see Vigilius c. Eut.; S. Ambr. de Incarn. c. 7, fin.; S. Ath. Ep. ad Epict. in Petav. de Inc. v. 10, 7 and 11). "Impanation" would be "a *local* inclusion of the Body of Christ in the bread." But it is taught by the Schoolmen that "our Lord's Body is *locally* in Heaven" (see in Letter to the Bishop of London, p. 73, sqq., ed. 8vo). Bellarmine (de Sacr. Euch. iii. 11), quoting Guitmundus, uses Impanation for the "hypostatic assumption of the bread by the Word," or "the mingling of the Body of Christ with the bread."

[5] See "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 1—31. "The belief that the elements remain after consecration in their natural substances was not supposed of old to involve any tenet of Consubstantiation."

[6] See "Real Presence," pp. 32—56. "Consubstantiation was not held by the Lutheran body; statement expressed in the Lutheran Articles."

[7] Ed. Germ. See Hospinian, Hist. Sacram. P. ii. p. 155, sqq.

any absence, or cessation, or annihilation of the substance of the outward elements. In taking them literally, we are bound to take equally in their plain sense His other words, in which He calls what He had just consecrated to be sacramentally His Blood, "this fruit of the vine;" or, again, those other words of Holy Scripture; "the Bread which we break;" "as often as ye eat this Bread;" "whosoever shall eat this Bread;" "so let him eat that Bread;" "we are all partakers of that one Bread." Our Blessed Lord, through those words, "This is My Body," teaches us that which it concerns us to know, His own precious Gift, the means of union and incorporation with Himself, whereby He hallows us, nourishes our souls to life everlasting, re-forms our nature and conforms it to His own; re-creates us to newness of life; binds and cements us to Himself as Man; washes, beautifies, kindles our minds, strengthens our hearts; is a source of life within us, joining us to Himself our Life, and giving us the victory over sin and death. Yet He did not deny what Himself and Holy Scripture elsewhere seem in equally plain language to affirm.

It is no unusual way of teaching in Holy Scripture, to speak of that *only*, which is at the time meant to be declared or impressed upon us. Almighty God does not, in the way of those laboured statements which we are sometimes compelled to make, guard His own words so as to express in each the whole of His truth, or preclude absolutely

their being misunderstood. Thus Holy Scripture says, "Man became a living soul;" without implying that he ceased to be material. Again, when Adam, under inspiration, says, "This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh," he speaks of that which Eve derived from him, and not of that which, besides, God, by His creative power, "builded" her up to be, or of the soul which He infused into her.

Again, "to those who believe, to them gave He power to become the sons of God[8]," yet did they not thereby cease to be, as men, common men. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ,[9]" without thereby ceasing to be earthly kingdoms.

Or, to take a more awful instance, in order to inculcate the amazing condescension of the Incarnation, God says, "the Word became Flesh;" designating our human nature by that which is meanest in us, and most degraded. Apollinaris raised his heresy on an exclusive interpretation of the words, as though our Lord had taken flesh only, and not a human soul also. Another blasphemy, which might be raised in the same way, is guarded against in the Athanasian Creed: "not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the Manhood into God." "The Word became flesh," "not by conversion of substance," because He, being God, is Unchangeable; but by taking upon Him our real Human Flesh in the form of a servant.

[8] John i. 12. [9] Rev. xi. 15.

Nor, again, are we entitled to make any one statement of Holy Scripture, exclusively, the rule for all the rest. Such has ever been the ground of heresy. The Arians rested their dogma on our Lord's Words: "My Father is greater than I," and applied them to our Lord's Divine, not, as the orthodox, either to His Human Nature, or to His Person, as in order, not in time, coming after the Father's[1].

Every heresy almost has been built upon some insulated statement in God's Word. God inculcates at one time, one side of Divine truth; at another, another; in order that our finite human minds may grasp, in their degree, truth after truth, and each may sink more deeply in our souls. God rarely teaches together the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and His Humanity. The very words which contain both in one most plainly, have become the occasion of deadly heresy. We have to prove separately the Divinity of God the Holy Ghost and His Personality. Prophecy declared together our Lord's state of humiliation, and the "glory which should follow." It united also the glory which He had before the world was, and the glory which His Human Nature should have. It does not unite His previous Glory, "Mighty God, Everlasting Father," and His Atoning Death. The Jews rejected our Lord, and then invented their fable of two Messiahs, because thay knew not how to blend

[1] See Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. ii. 5. 8; iv. 2. 8, 9. Petav. de Trin. ii. 2, 2.

the separate truths, and waited not patiently to see how our Lord would unite them. In their unbelief they were the instruments of blending what they thought God could not blend.

Again, misbelievers have scoffed, because the mysteries of the Unity of God and of the Holy Trinity are thus declared in separate passages.

And so as to man, and the gifts of God to man. He speaks of the Church as "without spot or wrinkle," and of all Christians as saints; yet elsewhere of the tares and the wheat, "the many called, and the few chosen." Our Lord says, "I will be with you always even unto the end of the world;" and asks, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" He speaks to us, as if our salvation were secure, and His sheep could not perish, and yet, as if all depended upon ourselves. He speaks as if for those who "sin wilfully, after that they have received the knowledge of the truth," there were nothing left but a "fearful looking for of judgment[2];" and yet He says, "Come unto Me, *all* that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He tells us at one time, that we are "justified by faith;" at another, "by works." He tells us that "faith saveth," that we are saved by the Name of Christ, by grace, by the washing of regeneration, or by Baptism, by, or in hope, and that he who turneth "a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death[3]." And yet all these,

[2] Heb. x. 26, 27.

[3] Eph. ii. 5. Acts iv. 12. Tit. iii. 5. Rom. viii. 24. Jas. v. 20.

and other separate fragments of teaching, unite and blend in one whole of living truth; as the scattered rays of the sun in the whole earth centre in one glorious orb, or as the rich colours of His bow unite in the colourless light, which gives light, and colour, and beauty, and life unto all which lives.

We cannot, then, infer that our Blessed Lord's words, "This is My Body," convey His whole teaching as to the Holy Eucharist. They declare one truth; they deny none. They affirm what It is; they do not deny It to be also physically what It was, any more than the great words, "the Word became flesh," imply that the Unchangeable underwent change; or the saying, "Man became a living soul," implies that he was not also flesh. Our Blessed Lord does not say, "This is a figure of My absent Body," nor does He say, "This has altogether ceased to be bread, and is the same Body in the same way, as that which you see with your bodily eyes;" but simply, "This is My Body."

The Presence, of which our Lord speaks, has been termed Sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, as opposed *not* to what is real, but to what is natural. The word has been chosen to express, not our knowledge, but our ignorance; or that unknowing knowledge of faith, which we have of things Divine, surpassing knowledge. We know not the manner of His Presence, save that it is not according to the natural Presence of our Lord's Human Flesh, which is at the Right Hand of God; and therefore it is called Sacramental. But it is a Presence without us,

not within us only; a Presence by virtue of our Lord's words, although to us it becomes a saving Presence, received to our salvation, through our faith. It is not a Presence simply in the soul of the receiver, as "Christ dwells in our hearts by faith;" or as, in acts of Spiritual, apart from Sacramental, Communion, we, by our longings, invite Him into our souls. But while the consecrated elements, as we believe (because our Lord and God the Holy Ghost in Holy Scripture call them still after consecration by the names of their natural substances, and do not say that they cease to be such),—while the consecrated elements remain in their natural substances, still, since our Lord says, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," the Church of England believes that "under the form of Bread and Wine," so consecrated, we "receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ[4]." And since we receive them, they must be there, in order that we may receive them. We need not then (as the School of Calvin bids men) "ascend into Heaven, to bring down Christ from above." For He is truly present, for us truly to receive Him to the salvation of our souls, if they be prepared by repentance, faith, love, through the cleansing of His Spirit, for His Coming.

Both interpretations of His sacred words—as well that which says, "This is not bread, and nothing else but His Body," and that other, "This is a figure of His absent Body"—introduce that into them, which

[4] Homilies, l. c.

does not lie in them. Christ hath said, "This is My Body;" He saith not, by what mode. We believe what He, the Truth, saith. Truth cannot lie. How He bringeth it to pass, we may leave to His Omnipotency. It is a law which He hath impressed upon physical nature, that two bodies cannot be in the same place at the same time. And yet we receive, without doubting, that our Lord, in His spiritual Body, passed, on the morning of the Resurrection, through the sealed tomb. For the Angels rolled away the stone to show that He *was* risen [5]. He passed through the closed doors, so that the disciples thought that "it was a Spirit," as He had passed before, *illæsa virginitate*, through the doors of the Virgin's womb [6]. We do not stay to inquire in what way the substance of His Body passed through the substance of the closed doors. Enough that God has said it. As it passed, it must have been in the same place, penetrating, but not displacing them. Still less need we ask, by what law of nature that Sacramental Presence can be, which is not after the order of nature, but is above nature.

[5] ἠγέρθη. See on these miracles, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 56—59.

[6] This is stated in the Allocut. Conc. Chalc., Par. 3, t. iv. p. 1763, ed. Col.; and, of individual Fathers, by S. Irenæus, S. Clem. Alex., S. Greg. Nyss., Theodoret; and of the Latins, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine (although the homilies quoted are spurious), S. Paulinus, Gaudentius, S. Leo, Ep. 28. ad Flavian. c. 4, Maximus Taur. Hom. 2. de Nat. Christi, B. P. vi. 5. See in Petav. de Incarn. 14, 6.

"As[7] all things whatsoever God made, He made by the operation of the Holy Spirit, so also now, the operation of the Spirit worketh that which is above nature, which faith alone can receive. 'How shall this be to me,' said the Blessed Virgin, 'seeing that I know not a man?' Gabriel the Archangel answereth, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.' And now askest thou, how," under these outward forms, we receive "the Body of Christ, and the Blood of Christ? The Holy Spirit cometh down and worketh what is above discourse and above all thought."

This acknowledgment of our ignorance is a refuge from our perplexity about the things of God. We acknowledge, since Scripture saith it, that the natural substance remains. "What was bread remains bread; and what was wine remains wine[8]." But faith regards

[7] This passage is, with one alteration, S. John Damascene's (de Fide, iv. 13, p. 269). Using the words, but not directly quoting them, I thought it best, considering the circumstances under which I preached, and the power which existed, of condemning me unheard, to substitute the formula in the Homilies for that of the original. The original does not express the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it might have perhaps been so understood. In the original, instead of "how, under these outward forms, we receive the Body of Christ and the Blood of Christ," it stands, "how the bread becometh the Body of Christ, and the wine and water the Blood of Christ." On this expression, see "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 232—240.

[8] Newman's Sermons, vol. iv. p. 167. "We need," he added,

not things visible, only or chiefly; as it regarded not the outward dress of our Lord, save when it touched the hem of His garment, and virtue went out of Him, and healed those who touched in faith[9]. Yea rather, faith forgets things outward in His unseen Presence. What is precious to the soul is its Redeemer's Presence, and its union with Him. It acknowledges, yet is not anxious about, the presence of the visible symbols. It pierces beyond the veil. It sees Him Who is invisible, and receives Him in the ruined mansion of the soul; and by Him is strengthened; in Him has peace; in His Presence has the pledge of forgiveness and of everlasting union with its Lord and its God. It owns as a truth of fact, and as taught in God's word, the presence of the outward symbols. Its joy, the contentment of its longings, its hope, its strength, its stay, its peace, its life, is the Presence of its Lord.

But as, on the one hand, it is an unauthorized inference from our Lord's words, that the bread and wine are no longer there; so also, and even more, is it, that the words mean only, "This represents, is a figure of, My absent Body." It is true that the

"no carnal, earthly, visible miracle to convince us of the Presence of the Lord Incarnate. He Who is at the Right Hand of God, manifests Himself in that Holy Sacrament as really and fully as if He were visibly there. We are allowed to draw near, to 'give, take, and eat' His sacred Body and Blood, as truly as though, like Thomas, we could touch His Hands, and thrust our hand into His Side."

[9] S. Matt. ix. 20—22; xiv. 36.

outward elements are, as some of the Fathers call them, figures, types, symbols, images of His Body. But who authorized men to add, "of His absent Body?" Albeit our Lord speaks of nothing carnal or physical, who has revealed to man that when He said, "This is My Body," He meant that it was not His Body[10]?

All things combine to make us take our Lord's words solemnly and literally. All around is solemn and literal. "I hold it," says Hooker[1], "for a most infallible rule, in expositions of Holy Scripture, that when the literal construction will stand, the farthest from the literal is commonly the worst." Why should it not stand? Because it is impossible? "In mysteries," says a father, "we must believe simply; for therefore are they mysteries."

It was His last parting act, the anticipation of His Passion, His Testament in His Blood, His gift to His own in the stead of His own Visible Presence, a new revelation, applying and embodying in act what He had before taught, "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath everlasting life."

The solemnity of the words is enforced by the

[10] S. Cyril of Jerus., Lect. 22, § 2, p. 270, Oxf. Tr. "Since then He Himself has declared and said of the Bread, '*This is My Body*,' who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since He has affirmed and said, '*This is My Blood*,' who shall ever hesitate, saying, that it is not His Blood?"

[1] E. P. v. 59, 2.

almost unvarying uniformity with which they are recorded. God has appointed that four inspired writers should deliver to us the words of Institution. They repeat with an awful oneness, His action, His blessing, His gift, His words. S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. Paul, to whom our Lord revealed it from Heaven, say alike: "He took bread, He blessed, He brake, He gave it. He said, Take, eat, this is My Body." "He took the cup, He blessed, He gave it to them, He said, This is My Blood of the New Testament." The very words, "This is My Blood of the New Testament," are framed upon those whereby the old Covenant at Mount Sinai was sanctioned through the sprinkling of real blood of a sacrifice, appointed by God to shadow out the Atoning Blood which was shed upon the Cross. "And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words[2]." S. Paul contrasts the figures with the substance, "the blood of others," with which the first testament was dedicated, and "the Blood of Christ, Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God." The blood of the Old Testament was a shadow, not in itself, but in its value. It was the real, although unavailing, blood of bulls and goats, picturing that the Atonement should be through the shedding of the Precious Blood of Christ. But the picture itself

[2] Exod. xxiv. 8.

was real blood. When then our Blessed Lord, recalling the sanction of the Old Testament, by the very form of the words, added to them, "This is *My* Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins;" what else could the Apostles think, but that our Lord meant, that it was really and truly, and, in a Divine way, His Blood, and that they now and henceforth should in a new and nearer way be united with Him and live by Him, as He Himself had promised, "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him"? "Was it possible they should hear that Voice, 'Take, eat, this is My Body; drink ye all of this, this is My Blood;' possible that, doing what was required and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves[3]?"

When our Lord, for the hardness of men's hearts, spake in parables, He Himself expounded all things[4] privately to His disciples. The Evangelists themselves at times explain when He spake in a figure[5]; or the very language itself marks itself to be a parable. Our Lord in that solemn hour was completing the shadows of the law. Why should we think that He brought in a mere shadow, less expressive than those which He abolished? He, our good Master, was leaving "His Testament" in His Blood to His

[3] Hooker, E. P. v. 67, § 4. [4] Mark iv. 34.

[5] John ii. 19. 21; vii. 38, 39; vi. 70, 71.

Disciples, even to the end of the world. We do not think that even a man, in a testament, means to leave the mere figures of what he professes to bestow. Human principles of interpretation require that we should believe that a testator means what he says[6]. Reverence for the word of God requires, that we should not tamper with its apparent meaning, on any preconceived notions of our own.

In those words which men are wont to quote, Holy Scripture itself informs us that there *is* a figure, so often as there is one, lest we should exchange the substance for figures. Holy Scripture, in speaking of Almighty God, is full of figures. Well-nigh every thing which is said of Him, unless it be a simple declaration of His Attributes, as that He is Just, Holy, Good, must be a figure, expressing some reality. The very qualities of Almighty God are expressed to us in figures, borrowed from those qualities in man, which are some shadow of them. For patience, long-suffering, compassion, and the like, as much as anger or jealousy, imply literally some passion, which cannot be in God[7]. To speak of

[6] See "Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 60, 61. "It is a first principle of law, that in Testaments the plain meaning of words is not to be departed from.

[7] This is still more expressed in the sacred language, in which God condescends not only to attribute to Himself the quality, but to speak of it under metaphors describing its effects on man. "The anger of the Lord smoked" (Deut. xxix. 20); "was kindled," frequently; "went up," Ps. lxxviii. 21 (compare 2 Sam. xi. 20, of man), "slow of wrath;" "My soul loathed them" (literally, "was shortened for them," Zech. xi. 8), as

"attributes" at all, is to speak in figure; for God is One, Simple, Undivided Essence, in Whom Love is not separate from Justice, nor Holiness from Mercy, as in us the qualities of our mind balance and correct one another. In Him all is one. It is a just, holy, wise, good Love. Love of good and hatred of evil are one and the same in Him. To us they are different aspects of His All-Holy Love.

Abstract terms go but a little way in declaring to us the ways of God. He mirrors Himself in the works of His Hands. He stamps in the book of His Word the meaning of the book of His works. Even the works of men's hands, as being formed by minds which are made in the Image of God, in some way reflect His Image. The orders and ranks of earthly polity, as far as they proceed on the rules of eternal right, proceed from Him and reflect Him. The ritual of the Old Testament was prescribed, the history of the chosen people was overruled, to foreshadow that which was to come. All is one great picture-language, to make present to our senses and minds what is invisible, intangible, inconceivable.

Whether then our Lord be called a Lion, a Lamb, a Rock, a Hiding-place, a Fountain, a Vine,

expressing in man unendurance. On the other hand, the tenderest word expressing the mercy of God, describes Him as yearning over us. The very word, רחמים, from which the σπλάγχνα ἐλέους of the New Testament is taken, is even chiefly used of God. But this is a further use of metaphor. The plainest words are still figures, if, as they mostly are, they are taken from any quality in man.

a Door, a Branch, a King, a Judge, a Priest, a Shepherd, these are but different letters of the one great alphabet of that condescending language, in which God reveals Himself to man. It is, then, altogether a mistake to lay stress on any such condescending words of our Lord as "I am the Door;" "I am the true Vine." They are instances of the great picture-language of Holy Scripture, of just the same sort as when our Lords adds, "My Father is the Husbandman;" "I am the good Shepherd;" or, again, "I am Alpha and Omega;" "I am the bright and morning Star." "Am" does not in these cases signify "being the figure of," but the converse. The Door and the Vine are figures of our Lord. "Is" in Holy Scripture is used alike in figurative or in plain language; "I am the Door," as well as "the Word was God." It is used to join the two thoughts together, by which, whether in plain or figurative words, God wills to declare some truth. The figurative meaning does not lie in the word "is," but in the picture-word joined with it. Nor is there any case in Holy Scripture in which, being figurative, it is not indicated in the context that it *is* figurative[8]. The words "I am the true vine," "I am the door of the sheep," occur in parables. S. Paul does not say, "that Rock was Christ," until he had before said, "that spiritual rock[9];" showing that he spake in a figure. When he says, "Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," he says also, "it is an allegory."

[8] See further, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 61—69.

[9] 1 Cor. x. 4.

But the word "Body" is no figure. For our Lord says, "This is *My* Body;" and not so only, but "This is My Body which is given for you." Since, then, it was His true Body which was given *for* us upon the Cross, it is His true Body which is given *to* us in the Sacrament[1]. The manner of the Presence of the Body is different. The Body which is present is the same, for He has said, "This is My Body which is given for you."

S. Paul's words are an expansion and application of our Lord's. Our Lord says, "This is My Body;" S. Paul, "Is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?" Our Lord says, "This is My Blood;" S. Paul, "Is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?" There is no bond between a communion and a figure. Had the Holy Eucharist been only a figure, there would be nothing whereof It could be a communion. True, what we see, in that it is broken, is an image of His Body which was slain;

[1] Of the Calvinistic theory even Beza says, "Certainly it would be too absurd to interpret the names of the Body and Blood of the fruit and efficacy of the Death of the Lord, or to restrain them to the spiritual object thereof alone. To make this perfectly plain, let us substitute that interpretation for these words, 'Body' and 'Blood,' and say, 'This is the efficacy of My death, which is given for you, and this is My Spirit which is poured out for you.' What more senseless than such a mode of speaking? For certainly those words, 'which is given for you,' of necessity constrain men to understand it of the very substance of the Body and Blood of Christ."—Epist. 5. ad Aleman, p. 57, ed. Gen., quoted by Gerhard, loci 22, c. 10.

and in that it is poured out, is an image of His Blood which was shed. That which is seen is an image of the reality which is unseen. Yet God says not by S. Paul it is an image, but it is "the communion of the Body of Christ." But, in order to be a communion of It, there must be That of which it is the communion. "Why," asks S. Chrysostom[2], "did he not say 'participation' (μετοχή)? Because He wished to point out something more, to show how great is the conjunction (συνάφεια). For we communicate, not by sharing only and partaking, but also by being united. For as that Body is united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by this Bread." S. Chrysostom, no more than the Church of England, had any thought of what is physical or carnal. When we too are taught to pray that we "may so eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood," we mean a real, actual, though Sacramental and spiritual drinking; we do not mean a figurative cleansing by a figurative eating and drinking.

But in that we press the literal meaning of these words of our Lord and of S. Paul, we do, in fact, bind ourselves to take with equal strictness those other words of both: "this fruit of the vine," and "this bread." If one might be taken figuratively, so might the other. If, as the Genevan school would have it, the words "this is My Body" were figura-

[2] Ad loc. Hom. 24, § 4, p. 327, Oxf. Tr.

tive, or if, as Roman Divines say, S. Paul's words were figurative, "the bread which we break," it would be but consistent to say with some modern sectaries, that the words "so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," are figurative too.

Our Lord does not say more distinctly, "This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins," than He subjoins immediately, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom." He says as plainly, "this fruit of the vine[3]," as He had said, "This is My Blood." He says both. We believe both.

Again, whatever else our Lord may have meant by "drinking this fruit of the vine new in the kingdom of My Father," the literal sense can scarcely be excluded. The literal does not exclude the spiritual, but is the basis of it. The Apostles, in proof of the reality of the Resurrection, lay stress on the fact, that they "*did* eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead." Most probably, our Lord was preparing the souls of His disciples to look for Him again after His death, which they could not bear to think of or believe, and spake of being again with them as before, only in a new way. If, by the kingdom of God He means, at least in its

[3] See on this text, "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 69—74. "The bearing of our Lord's words, 'I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine,' on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist."

beginnings, that kingdom which He set up after His Resurrection, when He says, "All power is given to Me in Heaven and in earth;" and by the drinking of the fruit of the vine or wine then, He means in part the taking natural food with them, in proof of His Resurrection; then it would be unnatural to understand Him as not speaking of what was a natural substance then. We could not paraphrase His words, "I will not drink this, which was wine once, but is so no longer, until, after My Resurrection, I drink it new in its natural substance." Roman controversialists alternately concede, that "the fruit of the vine" does mean the natural substance of wine; only then they maintain it not to have been said of the wine just consecrated, but of common wine; or they concede it to be (as S. Matthew distinctly shows that it is) used of that of which He had just said, "This is My Blood," and say that it means the accidents of wine only. Each grants *that* part of the natural meaning which he can afford. The one, that "the fruit of the vine" is to be understood of the natural substance; the other, that the words which our Lord uttered immediately after the consecration of the Cup, refer to that "fruit of the vine" which He had just consecrated. Put the two together, and you cannot escape the inference: *therefore*, that which He had just consecrated was still, physically and in its natural substance, the natural fruit of the vine.

There is then no ground from Holy Scripture to

make the language of our Lord or S. Paul figurative, whether as to the outward elements, that we should think that the bread and wine cease to be in their natural substances, or as to the real inward spiritual Presence of His Body and Blood, whereby our good Lord in His unutterable love "dwells in us, and we in Him, is one with us, and we with Him." The Catholic Fathers, to whom our Canon[4] refers as our guides in understanding Holy Scripture, take both alike literally. "It is not to be denied," says Thorndike[5], "that all Ecclesiastical writers do, with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the Consecration; or *that*, to any faith but that upon which the Church professeth to proceed to the celebrating of it. And upon this account, when they speak of the elements, supposing the Consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the name, not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become." "But this change," he says[6], "is not destructive to the bodily substance of the elements, but cumulative of them with the spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood."

It should be added, that when the Fathers speak

[4] Canon about Preachers enacted in Convocation, A.D. 1571.

[5] Epilogue, B. 3, c. 4, pp. 30—33, § 27, p. 69, ed. Angl. Cath. Lib.

[6] Ib. § 45, p. 82.

of the elements as remaining, they are most often speaking very accurately, in the illustration of the faith against heresy. When they are speaking devotionally of the wonderfulness of God's Gift, it is natural that they should speak only of that gift itself, the Presence of Christ, and the actual imparting of His Body and Blood, not of the outward elements, through which that gift is conveyed.

Thus, on the one side, S. Irenæus, against heretics who denied the Resurrection of the body[7], says, "Bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly." Tertullian[8], against the Gnostics, says, "The bread taken and distributed to the disciples, He made *that* His own Body, saying, 'This is My Body,' i. e. the figure of My Body. But it would not be a figure, unless His Body were a true Body." Tertullian believed the elements to be a figure too of His Body, not as absent, but as present. He argues from the reality of the figure to the reality of the thing figured. There could be no real figure of that which had no real substance. But unless the natural substance really remained, the figure itself, i. e. the accidents, would also be a phantom. Had the Church then believed that the elements were acci-

[7] The following passages from the Fathers on this head are given more fully, and questions which have been raised as to some are considered in "Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 75—90.

[8] Adv. Marcion., iv. 20.

dents without substance, the Gnostics might have retorted: "Unsubstantial accidents are an appropriate figure of such a Body as we conceive, unsubstantial." Again, against the same heretics who rejected matter, he speaks of the physical substance of bread, as the outward visible means of the one Sacrament, just as he does of the physical substance of water in the other great Sacrament; or of the oil, honey, milk, in other rites of the Church. Again, in that he says, "He makes His Body present *by* the bread," he asserts the presence of that bread, whereby He makes It present. Another[9] argues against the same heretics: "If, as these say, He was fleshless and bloodless, of what flesh, or of what body, and of what blood, did He, giving the *images*, enjoin upon the disciples both the bread and the cup?" S. Chrysostom argues against the Apollinarians from the twofold substance in the Holy Eucharist, and says that after Consecration, "the nature of bread remains in it." Theodoret, against the Eutychians, says, "Neither after Consecration do the mystic symbols depart from their own nature; they remain in their former substance; He doth not change the nature, but adds grace to the nature." Pope Gelasius says that "the elements abide in their own proper nature." Facundus, against the Adoptians: "The Sacrament of His Body and Blood which is in the consecrated Bread and Cup, we call His Body and Blood; not that the Bread is properly

[9] Adamantius, probably about the age of Constantine. See Benedictine Præf. T. i. p. 800-2. ed. De la Rue.

His Body, or the Cup His Blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of His Body and Blood." Ephrem of Antioch against the Eutychians: "The Body of Christ which is received by the faithful, neither departeth from the sensible substance, nor is separable from the invisible grace."

Again, when great writers, as S. Athanasius, S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, or S. Cyril[1], say that they are not "*bare* elements," not "*common* bread," nor "*mere* bread and a *mere* cup," it is plain that they must have believed them, as we do, to be still real elements in their natural substances; and that the more, since they use the same words of the water of Baptism or the oil of the Chrism.

Again, when others, as S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. Macarius, Eusebius, Theodoret, Eustathius, S. Augustine[2], say, as did Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images of our Lord's Body and Blood, as it is clear from their own writings that they did *not* mean figures of an *absent* body, so also is it that they did mean, that there was a real visible substance which was the image or symbol of the *present* spiritual, invisible substance.

Again, the emblem of the burning coal with which Isaiah's lips were hallowed, which was received throughout the East (in S. Ephrem and S. James of Sarug, in S. Chrysostom and Theodoret, in the

[1] See the passages in "The Doctrine of the Real Pres." pp. 91—93.

[2] See the passages, Ib. pp. 94—118.

Liturgies of S. James, S. Chrysostom, and S. Cyril[3]), implies an inward real Presence, and a real outward substance. Whence S. Ephrem often speaks of our Lord's Presence, under the image of "fire *in* the bread." "*In* Thy visible vesture there dwelleth a hidden power." "*In* Thy Bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten. *In* Thy Wine there dwelleth the Fire that cannot be drunk." "Instead of that fire which devoured men, ye eat a Fire *in* Bread, and are quickened." "*In* the Bread and the Cup are fire and the Holy Ghost." "We have eaten Thee, we have drunken Thee, not that we shall make Thee fail, but that we might have life in Thee. Thy garment covered Thy feebler nature: the bread covereth the fire which dwells therein[4]."

Tertullian[5] says, "*In* the bread is understood His Body." S. Augustine[6] says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ commended His Body and Blood *in* those things which are, out of many [many grains and many grapes], reduced into some one." S. James of Sarug[7], "He from whom the spirits of fire have their glow, Him *in* Bread and Wine thou seest on the Table."

Again, so literally did early Fathers take the words "this fruit of the vine," that it was the

[3] See the passages in "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 119—130.

[4] See the passages fully, Ib. pp. 122—124.

[5] De Orat. c. 6, p. 303, Oxf. Tr.

[6] In Joann. Tract. 26, n. 17.

[7] In Ass. Bibl. Or., t. iii. p. 326.

foundation of the doctrine of the Millennium, so largely held in the early centuries, while not a few make some inference from it, to establish the use of wine in the Holy Eucharist, or as a proof of the Resurrection[8].

Again, it was a philosophy well known to the Fathers, that accidents do not nourish, and that they do not exist separate from their substance; and yet they simply assume that the elements are converted into the substance of the human body, and do nourish it. S. Justin Martyr, a philosopher before he was converted, says, in one and the same place, that the bread and wine of the Holy Eucharist are not *common* bread and wine (and so, surely that they are bread and wine), and that they are the Body and Blood of our Incarnate Lord; and that from this food our flesh and blood are by change [into our substance] nourished[9].

Again, the Fathers use undoubtingly the word which we have in our services, "spiritually," opposed as it is, not to really and sacramentally, but to physically and carnally. Thus S. Clement of Alexandria[1]: "Wherefore the Saviour, having first taken bread, spake and gave thanks. Then, having broken the bread, He placed it before them, that we may eat

[8] See further in "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 134—140.

[9] Apol. i. 66, p. 83. Tertullian also says, "The flesh feedeth on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul too may be nourished from God."—*De Res. Carn.* § 8. See further in "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 141—161.

[1] Strom. i. 10, p. 343, ed. Pott.

reasonably." S. Athanasius[2]: "On this ground He mentioned the Ascent of the Son of Man into Heaven, that He might withdraw them from corporeal thoughts, and that they might understand that the Flesh spoken of was spiritual Food from above, and spiritual nourishment given by Him." S. Macarius[3]: "They who partake of the visible bread, spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord." S. Ambrose[4]: "In that sacrament Christ is, because it is Christ's Body; it is not, therefore, bodily food, but spiritual. Whence also the Apostle says of its type, 'Our fathers ate a spiritual food, and drank a spiritual drink;' for the Body of God is a spiritual Body: the Body of Christ is Body of a Divine Spirit; for Christ is a Spirit." S. Augustine: "Eat Life, drink Life; thou shalt have life, and the life is entire. But then shall the Body and the Blood of Christ be each man's life, if what is taken in the Sacrament visibly is, in the truth itself, eaten spiritually, drunk spiritually[5]."

To add some single expressions[6]: a near disciple of S. Ambrose says, that the things which were and should be are changed into something else." Physically they are what they were: sacramentally they are the Body and Blood of Christ. Origen[7]

[2] Ep. iv. ad Serap. § 19, p. 710. [3] Hom. 27, § 17, p. 164.

[4] De Myst. fin. § 58.

[5] Serm. cxxxii. [lxxxii. Oxf. Tr.] ii. p. 573. O. T.

[6] De Sacram. n. 15 ap. S. Ambr. See "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 281, 282, and Note 6.

[7] In Matt. t. xi. n. 12. See the whole passage in "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 147—149.

speaks of the matter of bread "remaining in the food consecrated by the Word of God." S. Augustine says, "One thing is seen, another understood. What is seen, hath a bodily form; what is understood, hath a spiritual fruit[8]." S. Epiphanius speaks of superadded power, "*That which is seen is round and insensate as to power.* He willed to say by grace 'This is of Me that, and no one disbelieveth His Word.' The bread is food, but the power in it is to the giving of life[9]." S. Hilary: "We received the Word, made Flesh, through the food of the Lord[1]." The food *through* which we receive It is surely real.

Nor does it in any way weaken the force of this proof, that several of the Fathers use such words as transmute, transmake, transform, trans-element, re-order, of the working of the consecration, nor again that they illustrate that working by other Divine operations, some of which are physical changes.

Those words no not express the doctrine of the scholastic Divines. They do not express change of substance (for μεταστοιχείωσις is not used in its etymological meaning), while the word now used of change of substance was then unknown. And further, all these words are also, by the very same Fathers, used of spiritual changes, which do not involve change of substance, and in some of which to sup-

[8] Serm. 272 ad Inf. See "The Doct. of Real Pres." p. 530.

[9] Ancor. c. 57, Expos. Fid. Cath. c. 16, p. 1096.

[1] De Trin. viii. 13.

pose a change of substance would be blasphemy, or would contradict an article of faith.

In the same context, in which a Father speaks of the sacramental change, he says, using the same word, "The Body [of Christ] by the indwelling of God the Word, was transmade, μετεποιήθη, into the Divine dignity[2]."

More largely, the Fathers[3] speak of the change and "transmaking of the human nature into the Divine;" they say that "the Lord's Body was *trans-elemented* into incorruption;" "the Flesh of our Lord *becometh* Christ and Lord;" "the Flesh of the Manhood was *transmade* into the Divine Nature;" "what was visible *became* Christ and Lord."

More frequently yet do they use the words of a change which is wholly spiritual, the change of regeneration. "Our nature is by Baptism," they say, "transformed from corruptible to incorruptible;" "spiritually trans-elemented from a foul to a better state;" "trans-elemented to the ancient image through the Spirit;" "trans-elemented to that which was above nature." Again they say, "repentance transmakes nature;" "habits are new-made into nature;" "instruction re-orders the man;" the body is raised again the very same, but is transmade, trans-elemented into incorruption. They use the illustration, "iron (red hot) *becometh* fire." They say, "we are *changed* into the substance of

[2] S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. Catech. c. 37. See it at length, "The Doct. of the Real Pres." p. 182.

[3] See "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 165—259.

angels;" "the body *passeth* into the nature of the soul;" "nature is *changed* into a heavenly substance;" "saints are *changed* into angels;" "Christians are wholly *trans-elemented* into Christ, Who hath power to impart life."

Again, the object of the likenesses used by the Fathers, is either to illustrate the power of God, as put forth in our behalf, in things which we know, that we may not start back at the greatness of His gift in the Holy Eucharist, or to show how things, outwardly the same, may be inwardly, yet spiritually, not physically, changed, or how grace may be conveyed through visible symbols[4]. But it does not therefore follow that they held the change to be of the same nature, or in the same degree. If the likeness were unduly pressed on the one side, as in the Miracle of Cana, it would be inferred that one physical substance was changed into another, not previously existing; which would be heretical. If other likenesses were pressed, it might be inferred that there was only an outward consecration, without any spiritual change or any inward sacred Presence. S. Gregory of Nyssa, cited in proof of transubstantiation, illustrates the grace of Baptism, by the holiness of an Altar, the change in the Holy Eucharist, the oil of confirmation, the consecration of a priest, the rod of Moses, the mantle of Elijah, the wood of the Cross, the bush where God was seen. These are valid to the end for which S. Gregory quotes them, that God uses the mean things of

[4] See further "The Doct. of the Real Pres." pp. 264—299.

this world in showing forth His own glory. But since the changes are of every sort, nothing can be inferred as to the nature of that change. The Altar has but an outward sanctity. The bush was but the place of a miracle. Elijah's mantle once, Moses' rod oftentimes, were the instruments of God's miraculous power. The Wood of the Cross was the instrument, not of a miracle, but of the all-Atoning Sacrifice. The Priest is not, of necessity, inwardly sanctified. The rod, when changed into a serpent, was changed in outward form also. So far was S. Gregory from contemplating a physical change, that he, as well as others, compares together the sacred oil, and the wine of the Holy Eucharist. No one of these likenesses fully agrees with the Holy Eucharist. In pressing one point, people have forgotten that others might be pressed in the opposite way. They overlook the rule which holds in interpreting our Lord's own Divine parables, where He Himself frames and points out the likeness, viz. that the likeness is not to be extended beyond the direct scope and intention of the parable itself.

On both grounds it may be assumed, that the Fathers did not intend to assert any physical change in the material substance; and when they asserted, as they do continually, that what is consecrated and what we receive, are the Body and Blood of Christ, they mean this, not in any physical or carnal way, but spiritually, sacramentally, Divinely, mystically, ineffably, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost.

But, in this meaning, they do speak of the objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, as following upon the consecration. This they teach unvaryingly from the times of the Apostles, as strongly and as distinctly as any other portion of the Faith.

I will quote the language not of one, two, or three, not from one age or one school, but the uniform teaching of the Fathers of every Church and of every variety of mind, in every sort of writing, Epistles, Homilies, Treatises, &c., including above seventy writers of those times to which our Church teaches us to look with most reverence, and every individual whose name she has held out for our love[5].

[5] The authorities here quoted, together with other passages from those Fathers of whom there are larger remains, are given fully in their context in "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 315—715. In the following chronological arrangement, Cave has mostly been followed :—

	A.D.
1. S. Ignatius	101
2. S. Justin Martyr	140
3. S. Irenæus	167
4. S. Melito	170
5. Tatian	172
6. S. Clem. Alex.	193
7. Tertullian	
8. Inscript. Augustod., end of Cent. 2.	
9. S. Hippolytus	220
10. Origen	230
11. S. Firmilian	233
12. S. Dionysius Alex.	247
13. S. Cyprian (with Afr. Council)	248
14. S. Laurence	257
15. Magnes	265
16. S. Peter Alex.	301
17. Eusebius	315
18. Council of Nice	325
19. S. James, Nisibis.	
20. Athanasius	326
21. Anonym. de Solemnit.	
22. Juvencus	330

From S. Ignatius, who speaks of "misbelievers who confess not that the Eucharist is Flesh of our

	A.D.
23. Theodor. Heracl....	334
24. S. Julius.....	337
25. Council of Alexandria	339
26. Julius Firmicus	340
27. S. Theodore, successor to S. Pachomius	344
28. Thecla and Martyrs under Sapor.....	346
29. S. Cyril, Jerus. ..	350
30. S. Gregory Illum. Armen.	
31. Liberius	352
32. S. Hilary	354
33. Hilarius Diac.....	
34. S. Victorinus	362
35. Titus Bostrensis..	
36. S. Epiphanius....	368
37. S. Optatus	
38. S. Pacian.....	370
39. S. Ephrem, Syr.	
40. S. Basil	
41. S. Greg. Nyss. ..	
42. S. Greg. Naz. ..	
43. Cæsarius (brother of S. Greg. Naz.)	
44. S. Amphilochius	
45. Apollinarius	
46. S. Didymus	371
47. Esaias Abbas....	
48. S. Macarius	373
49. Euseb Alex. .. prob.	444

	A.D.
50. S. Ambrose.....	374
51. Auct. de Sacram. ap. S. Ambr.	
52. S. Jerome	378
53. S. Siricius	385
54. S. Theophil. Al.	
55. Jerome of Jerusalem	386
56. S. Gaudentius.....	387
57. S. Isaac Mag., about	390
58. S. Paulinus, Nol.	393
59. S. Maruthas (friend of S. Chrys.....	
60. S. Augustine	395
61. S. Chrysostome	398
62. Council of Carthage (Stat. Eccl. Ant.)	401
63. Philo Carpas.	
64. Victor, Antioch...	
65. S. Chromatius	402
66. S. Cyril, Alex. ..	412
67. S. Isidore, Pelus.	
68. Paulinus, Diac.	420
69. S. Maximus Taur...	422
70. Theodoret	423
71. Theodot. Ancyr. ..	430
72. S. Pet. Chrysol.....	433
73. S. Proclus	434
74. Sedulius	
75. S. Leo	440
76. Salvian	
77. S. Nilus	

Saviour Jesus Christ, the Flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again[1];" and who says of himself, "I have no taste for corruptible food, nor for the pleasures of this life. Bread of God I desire, Heavenly Bread, Bread of Life which is Flesh of Jesus Christ; and Drink of God I desire; His Blood which is love without corruption, and life for evermore[2];"—from S. Ignatius, —the successor of an Apostle, consecrated to the see of Antioch by the hands of S. Peter,—down to S. Leo, they speak with one voice. I will rehearse to you simply their own unaltered[3] words, without mingling one of my own. They say, then, "The[4] Lord provideth for us food from Himself. He offereth Flesh, and poureth out Blood, and nothing is wanting to the children's growth." "Being[5] both Flesh and Bread, He giveth Himself, being both, to us to eat." "He is the Bread of us who appertain to His Body[6]." "His Flesh is true Food[7]."

[1] Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 7, 8. [2] Ep. ad Rom. § 7.

[3] The grammatical form has been, in some places, altered, in order to avoid rapid changes of persons or the like.

[4] S. Clem. Al. Pædag. i. 6, p. 123.

[5] Id. Fragm., T. ii. p. 1018, ed. Pott.

[6] S. Cyprian [13], de Orat. Dom. n. 13, p. 187, Oxf. Tr. Others render "who touch His Body;" but I have retained the rendering as revised by Mr. Newman, since the context relates to His Mystical Body, with which we are united by Communion, and from which, by being forbidden Communion, we should be separated.

[7] Orig. [10] in Num. Hom. 7, n. 2.

"The Lord is true Bread, and His Flesh is mystical Food[1]." "He gave to believers His own Body and Blood, infusing into them the life-giving Medicine of Divinity[2]." "He gave them for food, the Heavenly Bread, Himself [gave] Himself[3]." "To nourish us, He spares not His own Flesh and Blood[4]." "He giveth Himself to thee, to receive within thee[5]." "God invites us to His own table, and sets before us His own Son[6]." "Our Lord gave His own Body, that they might eat, and His Blood that they might drink[7]." "He left us His own Flesh[8]." "He pours out as wine His own proper Blood[9]." "Taking the bread and then the Cup of wine, He attested that it is His Body and Blood[10]." "He embodieth Himself into food and drink, that He may ineffably rest the soul, and fill it with spiritual joy[11]." "He had consecrated the Blood of His own Body, to be poured

[1] Theodor. Heracl. [23] in Ps. 33, 9 (Corder. Cat. i. 596).

[2] Magnes [15], Fragm. § 3. Gall. iii. 541.

[3] αὐτὸς ἑαυτόν. Euseb. [17] in Ps. 80, 17, in Montfauc. Nov. Coll. i. 504. Comp. in Is. 65, 12. Ib. ii. 586.

[4] S. Chrys. [61] in ill. Vid. elig., § 15 ; T. iii. 327.

[5] Id. in S. Matt. Hom. 82, § 4, p. 1091, Oxf. Tr.

[6] Id. Hom. ii. in Nativ., § 7, T. ii. 430.

[7] S. James Nisib. [19], Serm. 14, de Pasch., n. 4, p. 342, ed. Rom.

[8] S. Chrys. Hom. 2, ad. Pop. Ant., § 9, fin. [on the Statues, p. 52, 3, Oxf. Tr.]

[9] S. Amphiloch. [44], Serm. adv. Arian. in Conc. Const. Act. Maii Nov. Coll. iv. p. 10.

[10] Tatian [5], Harmon. iv. Evang. Bibl. Patr. ii., P. 2, p. 210.

[11] S. Macar. [48], Hom. iv., p. 22, ed. Par.

forth for the remission of sins[1]." "He taught the disciples that He delivered His own Body,—that He had divided [among them] His own Blood[2]." "By the declaration of the Lord Himself, and by our faith, It is truly Flesh and truly Blood; and these, received and drunk, effect that both we are in Christ and Christ is in us[3]." "From bread (because He can and hath promised) He maketh His own Body; of wine, His own Blood[4]." "He consecrated the two gifts of life, of His Body and Blood[5];" "gave [His servants] as Food the sinless Flesh[6]." "Christ Himself 'prepared' for the Church 'the Body' of the Lord, at the time of the Mystical Feast, when He said, Take, eat[7]." "He mingled the nature of His Flesh with the nature of Eternity, under the Sacrament of the Flesh to be communicated to us[8]." "In all who believe the economy of grace, He inserts Himself through the Flesh[9]" . . . "mingling Himself in the bodies of believers, that by the union with the Immortal, man too might become partaker

[1] S. Hil. [32] in S. Matt. c. 31, n. 7, p. 743.

[2] Juvencus [22], Hist. Ev. L. iv. Bibl. Patr. iv. 74.

[3] S. Hil. de Trin. viii. 14.

[4] S. Gaudent. [56] de Pasch., Tr. ii. B. P. v., p. 946.

[5] Sedulius [74], Carm. Pasch. v. 3. Gall. ix. 592.

[6] Proclus [73], Orat. ix. init. Gall. ix. 655.

[7] Didymus Al. [46], ap. Corderii Cat. in Ps. 39. 7. T. i. p. 748.

[8] S. Hil. de Trin. viii. § 13.

[9] S. Greg. Nyss [41], Orat. Catechet. (The text is that of Maii Nov. Coll. vi. 370-2.)

of incorruption." "We know that the wine is consecrated into the Blood of Christ[1]." "That which is in the Cup is that which flowed from His side, and thereof do we partake[2]." "He was carried in His own Hands, when, commending His own very Body to us, He said, 'This is My Body'[3]." "He refreshed His Apostles with the food of His own Body[4]." "He is really present, because the Sacrament is His Body[5]." "The Eucharist becomes Christ's Body and Blood[6]." "The Bread becomes the Body, and the Cup, the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ[7]." "That same Christ who was crucified for us, makes them to become His Body and Blood[8]." 'The Word descends into that Bread, and that Cup, and it becomes His Body[9]." "The Bread, consecrated with thanksgiving by the prayer of the Word which is from Him, is (so we are taught) the Body and Blood of that Incarnate Jesus[10]." "It is the Divine Body which is consecrated on the Holy Table,

[1] S. Jerom. [52], L. iii. in Gal. v. 20.

[2] S. Chrys. in 1 Cor. x. 16. Hom. 24, § 3.

[3] S. Aug. [60] in Ps. 32, S. 1, § 10, p. 214.

[4] Anonym. de Solemnitat. &c., c. 6 [21], ap. Spicil. Solesm., p. 11, ed. Pitra.

[5] S. Chrys. in. ill. Vidi Dom., § 4, vi. 165.

[6] S. Iren. [3], v. 2, 3.

[7] S. Athan. [20], Serm. ad Neoph. ap. Eutychium in Luc. [Maii Coll. Nov. ix. 625.] See also S. Aug. Serm. 227, ad Inf. S. Cyril.Jer. [29], Cat. Myst. i. § 7.

[8] S. Chrys. de Prodit. Jud. i. 6. [9] S. Athan., l. c.

[10] S. Justin. [2], Apol. i. 66, p. 83, ed. Ben.

and indivisibly distributed to the whole sacred band, and partaken of without ceasing to be[1]."

"We have heard the true Master, the Divine Redeemer, the tender Saviour, commending to us our Price, His Blood. He spake to us of His Body and Blood. He called His Body food; His Blood, drink[2]." "The bread becometh the Body, and the Cup becometh the Blood of the Lord[3]." "The Spirit setteth forth (ἀποφαῖνον) on the Mystic table, the common bread to be the proper Body of His Incarnation[4]." "He was laid in the Manger that He might be eaten on the Table and become to believers a saving Food[5]." "He has sanctified for ever as food for us His own Flesh[6]." "He made His Body Food for the whole world, and satisfied all the ends of the world with His life-giving Body[7]."

[1] S. Cæsarius (brother of S. Greg. Naz.) [43]. Dial. 3, Interrog. 169, ap. Gall. vi. 127.

[2] S. Aug. Serm. 131, in Joh. 6, T. v. p. 640 [Hom. on N. T p. 585, Oxf. Tr.]

[3] Euseb. Alex. [49], Serm. v. in Maii Spicil. Rom. ix. p. 660.

[4] S. Isidore Pel. [67], Ep. i. 109, ad Marathon., p. 34.

[5] Theod. Anc. [71] Hom. in Nat. in Conc. Eph. P. 3, c. 9; iii. 1526, ed. Col.

[6] S. Paulin. [58] Ep. 23, ad Sever. § 7, T. i. p. 125, ed. Paris. Comp. S. Ambrose [50] de Bened. Patriarch. c. 9, n. 38. "He daily giveth us that Bread, which Himself, the Priest, daily consecrates with His own words." Auct. de Sacram. iv. 4, 12: "The word of Christ maketh the sacrament."

[7] S. Greg. Illum. Armen. [30], quoted by Niceph. c. Euseb. in Spic. Solesm. p. 500.

"The Lord Jesus gives us the true Bread: He eateth with us, and Himself is eaten; we drink His Blood, and without Him we cannot drink It[1]." "His own Divine Flesh and His Precious Blood hath He given us to eat and to drink for the remission of sins[2]." "Our Lord has given us His own Flesh as food[3]." "His Blood becometh to believers a saving drink[4]." "A Body is ministered from Heaven[5]." "In place of all those sacrifices and oblations, His Body is offered and is ministered to Communicants[6]." They say that "the Communicant knoweth both the Flesh and Blood of the Word of God[7]." "When ye receive the Body of the Lord, ye guard It with all caution and veneration, lest ever so little of it fall, lest aught of the consecrated gift drop off[8]." "His Body is set before us now[9]." "The hand receives the Lord's Body[10]."

They reprove those who are defiled, if they "ap-

[1] S. Jerome, Ep. 120, ad Hedib. 9. 2.

[2] S. Hippol. [9] in Prov. 9. i. p. 282, ed. Fabr.

[3] S. James Nisib. Serm. xiv. § 6, p. 345.

[4] S. Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Mos. i. p. 244.

[5] Liberius [31] ap. S. Ambros. de Virg. iii. 1. 1.

[6] S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, xvii. 20, § 2.

[7] Orig. in Lev. Hom. 9, n. 10: lit. "He who hath been initiated in the mysteries, knoweth, &c."

[8] Id. in Exod. Hom. 13, n. 3.

[9] S. Chrys. Hom. 51, in S. Matt. n. 3.

[10] S. Cypr. Ep. 58, ad Thibarit. § 10, p. 149, Oxf. Tr., and Inscript. Augustod. [8] in Spicil. Solesm. i. 557.

proach[1] their hands to," "invade[2]," "offend[3]," "presume to touch[4]," "violate[5]," "offer violence to[6]," "pollute[7]," "defile[8]," "profane[9]" the Body of the Lord; "receive the Lord's Body in defiled hands, and drink the Lord's Blood with polluted mouth[10];" "insult the Blood of Christ[11];" "receive with insolence the Body of Him who is God over all[12];" "that Body, the spotless, the pure, the associate with the Divine Nature." "How, think ye," they say, "is it less guilt to neglect the Word of God than to neglect His Body[13]?"

They blame those through whom "before Jews and Heathen an examination takes place as to the Body and Blood of Christ[14]." They say that "in a tumult the most Holy Blood of Christ was spilled[15];"

[1] Tertull. [7] de Idol. c. 7, p. 228. Oxf. Tr.

[2] S. Cypr. de Laps. § 11, p. 163, Oxf. Tr.

[3] Tertull. de Idol. l. c.

[4] S. Dionys. [12] Ep. ad Basil. can. 2. S. Firmil. [11] ap. S. Cypr. Ep. 75, § 23, p. 282, Oxf. Tr.

[5] S. Pacian [38] Paræn. ad Pæn. § 13, p. 370.

[6] S. Cypr. l. c.

[7] S. Jerom. in Mal. i. 7, T. vi. p. 949, ed. Vall.

[8] S. Chrys. non esse ad grat. concion. § 1. ii. 659.

[9] S. Cypr. Ep. 15, ad Mart. § 1, p. 38, Oxf. Tr.

[10] S. Cypr. de Laps. § 14, p. 167, Oxf. Tr.

[11] S. Ath. Apol. c. Arian. § 11. See p. 30, Oxf. Tr.

[12] S. Chrys. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24, § 7, p. 333, Oxf. Tr.

[13] Orig. Hom. 13, in Exod. § 3, l. c.

[14] S. Julius [24] in S. Athan. Apol. ag. Arians, § 31, p. 52, Oxf. Tr. The calumny was that Macarius had broken a chalice. Ib. p. 28, 90, 9. 3.

[15] S. Chrys. Ep. i. ad Innocent. § 3, T. iii. p. 519.

"the soldiers scattered the Body and Blood of Christ on the pavement [1];" the Donatists "broke the Chalices, which bare the Blood of Christ [2];" they say, "our sanctuaries are now, as ever, pure, dignified by the Blood of Christ alone, and by piety towards Him [3]."

They speak of "having the senses purified, so as to be able to eat the living Bread and His life-giving Flesh, and to drink His saving Blood [4];" "preparing for the sanctifying of souls and bodies, that they may be able to endure the Blood and Body of the Lord, the Saviour [5];" "abstain," they say, "from all uncleanness, and then take the Body and Blood of Christ, and carefully guard thy mouth, by which the King has entered [6];" "be holy and spotless, and so eat the Body of Christ and drink the Blood of Christ [7];" "have no anger in thy heart, if thou desire to receive the Body of Christ [8];" "touch not the Body of Christ with a fevered hand [9]." Idola-

[1] Victor Vit. de Persecut. Vandal. L. i. B. P. viii. 678. (His date, A. 484, is later by some years than that of the writers here quoted.)

[2] S. Opt. [37] de Schism. Don. vi. 2, p. 92, ed. Du Pin.

[3] Ep. Synod. Alex. [25], in S. Ath. Apol. c. Arian., § 5, p. 20, Oxf. Tr. (against charge of blood-shedding).

[4] Euseb. in Ps. 36. 4, Montf. Nov. Coll. i. 149.

[5] S. Theodore (successor of S. Pachomius) [27], Epist. de Pasch. Gall. iv. 734.

[6] S. James Nis. Serm. 3, de Jejun. § 2, p. 46.

[7] S. Basil [40], Reg. 80, c. 22.

[8] Isaias Abb. [47], Reg. ad Mon. n. 50, Gall. vii. 323.

[9] S. Ambros. de Vid. c. 10, n. 65; ii. 203.

ters are "cut off from the Body and Blood of Christ, whereby, long since, when re-born, they were redeemed[1]."

The Council of Nice says, "neither the rule nor practice handed down that they who have not power to offer should give the Body of Christ to those who offer[2]." Other fathers say that "the priests are entrusted with[3]," "minister[4]," "handle[5]," "give[6]," "distribute the Body of Christ[7];" "give to drink His Blood, the Cup of His Blood[8];" "present the Body of Christ[9];" that "the priests approach to the approaching God[10];" "the Deacons carry the Body and Blood of Christ[11]." To them "is committed the consecrated Blood of Christ[12]." It is

[1] S. Siricius [53], Ep. i. ad Himer. c. 3, Conc. ii. 1214. ed. Col.

[2] Can. 18, Conc. ii. 42 [18].

[3] S. Basil, Ep. 53, Chorep. § 1. iii. 147.

[4] S. Ambros. l. c.

[5] S. Greg. Naz. [42], Or. 21, § 7, p. 389.

[6] S. Jerom. adv. Lucif. § 3 ; ii. 173, ed. Vall.

[7] S. Basil. Ep. 199 (Canon. 2), Can. 27 ; iii. 294.

[8] S. Ath. Apol. c. Arian. § 11.

[9] "Obtulit Sancto [Ambrosio] Christi Corpus." Paulin. (Diac.) [68] Vit. S. Ambros. § 47, T. ii. App. p. xii.

[10] S. Greg. Naz. l. c.

[11] Philo Carpas. [63] in Cant. vii. 4, p. 164, ed. Rom.

[12] S. Laurence in S. Ambr. [14] de Off. i. 41, p. 214: "Cui commisisti Domini sanguinis consecrationem." I have rendered 'consecratio' as the abstract for the concrete. However deacons may have, here and there, irregularly consecrated, this was always regarded as a presumption. Carpentier (Supp. Du Cange v. Consecratio) quotes the words in the Canon Missæ of the

enacted that, "when need be, they may deliver to the people the Eucharist of the Body of Christ[1]." They are bidden, "give not to the unworthy the purple of the sinless Body[2]."

Again, of that which we receive they say, "We eat Him[3];" "eat Him entire as Life[4];" "we eat life[5];" "receive the Bread of the Lord's Body[6];" "eat the Body and drink the Blood, if thou desire life[7]; "eat the Living Bread and the life-giving

consecrated elements: "Hæc commixtio et consecratio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini," &c. The words used by S. Laurence are probably taken from that formula.

[1] Stat. Eccl. Ant., or Conc. Carth. iv. can. 38 [62], Conc. ii. 1440 [quoted Dist. 93, c. 18].

[2] S. Ath. in S. Matt. Mont. Nov. Coll. ii. p. 35.

[3] S. Ath. Exp. in Ps. 118, v. 171; i. 1219. S. Chrys. de Capt. Eutrop., § 18; iii. 393. Hom. 82, in S. Matt., § 4, p. 1091. Oxf. Tr., &c.: "He feeds on the richness of the Lord's Body, the Eucharist," Tertull. de Pudic. c. 9, p. 725, D. ed. Rig. S. Ephrem Syr., adv. Scrut. Rh. 10, p. 148, Oxf. Tr. Rh. 3. p. 22. Rh. 5, p. 32, not. n. S. Jerome, Ep. 21 ad Dam. 26, p. 79, ed. Vallars.

[4] S. Theoph. Al. [54] Fragm. ex Ep. Fest. i. ap. Cosm. in Montf. Nov. Coll. ii. 320.

[5] S. Jam. Nisib., Serm. 14, § 6, p. 347. S. Ambr. in Ps. 118, S. 18, § 28, p. 1203.

[6] S. Chromat. [65], Tract. 13, in S. Matt. § 5. Gall. viii. 348. Comp. S. Basil Mor. Reg. 21. Reg. 80, c. 22.

[7] S. Greg. Naz. Or. 45, § 19, p. 860. "He sent forth those two Baptisms from His pierced side, that those who had been washed with water might also drink His Blood." Tert. de Bapt. c. 16, p. 274, Oxf. Tr. Melito [4], explaining the Parable of Papias, interprets S. John vi. of the Holy Eucharist, Spicil. Solesm., Proleg. p. 6.

Flesh, and drink His saving Blood[1];" "the Flesh of Christ, which is indeed the Body of Life[2];" "that true Bread, the Living Word[3];" "that everlasting Word equal to the Father, wherewith Angels are fed[4];" "Christ—the Body of God—the God of Heaven[5];" "the Body of the Lord Jesus, in whom is remission of sins[6];" the[7] Body of the Author (of all things); "the Body of Him who hath life in Himself (τῆς αὐτοζωῆς), who, for our sakes tabernacled in our body, who is Christ, the Son of the Living God, one of the Holy Trinity[8];" "the proper Body of Him who is by Nature life, the Only-Begotten[9];" "a food which whosoever neglecteth to eat and drink, cannot have life in himself, as the Lord Himself saith[10]." "We drink the Blood of

[1] Eus. in Ps. 36, 4, p. 149, ed. Montf. S. Basil, Hom. in S. Bapt. § 2, ii. 115.

[2] S. Ambrose de Myst. c. 8, § 48, ii. 337. "If we do not eat the bread of life, if we do not eat the Flesh of Christ, and are not made to drink of the Blood of Christ," &c., Orig. Hom. 18, in Luc. T. 3, p. 977.

[3] S. Macar. Hom. 47, n. 11.

[4] S. Aug. in Ps. 33, § 6, i. 346, Oxf. Tr.

[5] Salvian [76], adv. Avarit. L. ii. p. 247, ed. Bal.

[6] S. Ambr. in Ps. 118, S. 8, § 48, p. 1074.

[7] Id. de Myst. c. 8, fin.

[8] S. Cyril. Al. [66], Hom. in Myst. Cœn. T. v., P. ii. p. 378.

[9] Id. Ep. in S. Symbol. T. v. P. 2, p. 189.

[10] S. Max. Taur. [69], Hom. 45, in Ps. 21 (quoting S. John, c. vi).

our redemption [1];" "we drink the Immortal Blood of Christ; our blood is joined to the Blood of Christ [2];" "life-giving Blood is offered to our lips [3];" "we drink His Holy Blood to the propitiation for our sins, and participation of the immortality in Him [4]." "The Church gives us daily that antidote of sorrow, the pure, true Blood of Christ [5];" "we receive the mystical Cup of the Blood of the Lord for the protection of our body and soul [6]." "We are fed from the Cross of the Lord, because we eat His Body [7];" "we drink not water from a rock, but Blood from His Side [8];" "we receive Him and lay Him up in ourselves, and place the Saviour in our breasts [9]." "He gives to thee the bread of blessing, His own Body, and bestows His own blood [10];" "we partake of [11]," "receive

[1] S. Leo [75], Serm. 42 (de Quadr. iv.), c. 5, p. 161.

[2] Jul. Firm. [26] de Err. Prof. Relig., p. 44, ed. Ouz.

[3] Thecla and Martyrs under Sapor [28] (quoted Klee, Dogmatik, B. 2, p. 197).

[4] S. Cyr. in Myst. Cœn. l. c.

[5] S. Epiph. [36], Expos. Fid. Cath., p. 1096, 7.

[6] Hilar. Diac. [33] in 1 Cor. xi. 26. App. S. Ambr. ii. 149.

[7] S. Aug. in Ps. 100, n. 9. T. iv. p. 1088 [Ps. 101, iv. 491, Oxf. Tr.].

[8] S. Chrys. in Ps. 46, § 2, v. 189.

[9] S. Clem. Alex. [6], Pæd. i. 6, p. 123. S. Clement adds εἰ δυνατόν, "as far as possible," because we receive Him who, as God, is infinite.

[10] Orig. in Jerem. Hom. 18, § 13. iii. 256.

[11] Dionys. Ep. ad Xyst. [ap. Eust. H. E. vii. 9]. S. Pet. Alex. [16] can. 8 (Routh, Reliq. iv. 31). S. Cyril Jer. Cat.

His Body and Blood[1]," "that saving Body, Christ Himself[2]." "Eating and drinking the Crucified[3]," "on every Lord's Day we are quickened by the hallowed Body of the same Saviour's Passover, and are sealed in our souls by His precious Blood[4]." "If we will, we have Him entire[5];" "we become Christ-bearers, His Body and His Blood being diffused through our members[6]." "The Christian," they say, "is fully convinced that he receives not mere bread and wine, but truly the Body and Blood of the Son of God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit[7]." "Faith gave me the pen of the Spirit, and I took, I wrote, and I confessed, 'This is the Body of God[8].'" "What we receive is the Body of Christ, and Christ is Life[9]." "As He lives by the Father, so we live

Myst. iv. 3. S. Ath. de Incarn. c. Arian. n. 16, fin. p. 883. S. Basil, Ep. 93, ad Cæsar. init. p. 186, Mor. Reg. 21. S. Theoph. Al. Epist. Pasch. xi. S. Chrys. Hom. 2, ad Pop. Ant. fin. (on the Statues, p. 53), de Bapt. Christi, § 4, p. 373, &c.

[1] Euseb. in Ps. 33, 9 (Montf. i. 132). S. Hil. de Trin. viii. 13. S. Ephr. in Exod. c. 12, T. 3, p. 213 (Select Works, p. 32, n. ed. Oxf.

[2] Is. Reg. ad Mon., Eus. in Ps. 21, 30. Montf. i. 85, n. 50.

[3] S. Aug. in Ps. 33. Enarr. 2, § 10 (Ps. 34, p. 361, Oxf. Tr.).

[4] Eus. de Pasch. Scriptt. Vett. Coll. Maii. i. p. 257.

[5] S. Chrys. in S. Matt., Hom. 51, § 3, p. 683, Oxf. Tr.

[6] S. Cyril Jerus. Cat. Myst. iv. 3, p. 271, Oxf. Tr.

[7] Jerome of Jerus. [55], Comm. util. Gall. vii. 529.

[8] S. Isaac the Great [57], Serm. de Fide in Ass. B. O. i. 220.

[9] Marius Victorin. [34] adv. Arian. ii. 8.

by His Flesh[1]." "He Himself is in us through the Flesh, and we are in Him[2]." "He mingles His Body in our body, and blends His Spirit with ours[3]." "In us there is a portion from Himself." "We receive Him within us that we may become the same as He[4]." "He commingleth Himself with us, and not by faith only, but in very deed maketh us His Body[5]." "That whereat Angels gaze with awe, thereby are we nourished; therewith are we mingled, and we become the one Body and the one Flesh of Christ." "He feeds us with His own Blood, and by every means entwines us with Himself[6]." "That same Flesh and Blood whereby He became akin to us, He gives forth to us. Wishing to show the longing He hath towards us, He hath mingled Himself with us, and blended His Body with ours, that we might in a manner be one thing, as the body joined to the Head[7]." "Christ gives us of His Flesh to be filled, drawing us on to greater love[8]." "He nourisheth and cherisheth the Church, and giveth her His own Body and Blood[9]." "That

[1] S. Hil. de Trin. viii. 16.

[2] Ib. § 14.

[3] S. Ephr. [39] Necros., Can. 12, T. vi. p. 243, ed. Ben. See also in "Select Works of S. Ephr." p. 346, note, ed. Oxf.

[4] S, Greg. Nyss., Hom. 8, in Eccl. T. i. p. 457.

[5] S. Chrys. in S. Matt., Hom. 82, § 5, p. 1091, Oxf. Tr.

[6] Ib. p. 1092.

[7] S. Chrys. in S. Joh. Hom. 46, § 3, p. 399, Oxf. Tr.

[8] Id. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24, § 7, fin. p. 334, Oxf. Tr.

[9] Theodoret in Ep. ad Eph. v. 29. iii. 434, ed. Sch.

very Body which sitteth above, is adored by Angels, is nigh to the Power incorruptible, of this do we taste[1]." "Whensoever we approach to His Body and Blood, and take It on our hands, so we embrace His Body, and are made (as it is written) of His Flesh and of His Bones[2]." "Thou who receivest the Flesh, partakest, in that Food, of His Divine substance[3]." "We are called Christ's body and members, as receiving through the Eucharist the Son Himself within us[4]." "That deathless Body coming to be in him who receives It, transmutes our whole being into Its own Nature[5]." "The precious and undefiled Body and Blood of Christ, the God of all, purify from every defilement those who partake thereof with much fear and earnestness[6]." "Christ cometh to be in us through His own Flesh[7]." "Those who are in Christ He Himself sanctifies, holily offered through the mystical Eucharist, wherein we are blessed and quickened[8]." "He gives Himself

[1] S. Chrys. in Ep. ad Eph. Hom. 3, § 3. See p. 130, Oxf. Tr.

[2] S. Maruthas [59], Comm. in Evang. ap. Assem. B. O. i. 180.

[3] Auct. de Sacr. [51], vi. 1, ap. S. Ambr. ii. 381.

[4] S. Cyril Al. in S. Joh. vi. 56 fin. L. iv. p. 364.

[5] S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. Catechet., according to Maii's text, Nov. Coll. vi. 368.

[6] S. Nilus [77], Ep. i. 44, ad Philipp. Schol., p. 21, ed. Rom.

[7] S. Hil. de Trin. viii. 1. S. Cyril in S. Joh. vi. 55, L. iv. p. 363, and again, p. 365.

[8] Tit. Bostr. [35] in Luc. 22, 4, in Cramer, Catena ii. 155.

for a spiritual feast and banquet[1]." "He has given us to be filled with His holy Flesh. He has set before us Himself sacrificed[2]." "He Who gave Himself as the Bread of life, Who poured out His Blood into the Cup of Salvation[3]." "He who receiveth the Flesh of our Saviour Christ, and drinketh His Precious Blood, as He saith, is found as one thing with Him, commingled, as it were, and immingled with Him through the participation, so that he is found in Christ, and Christ again in him[4]." "The Body [of Christ] is not Consubstantial with the Word from God, yet is one by that ineffable coming-together and concurrence; and since the Flesh of the Saviour became life-giving, as being united to That which is, by nature, Life, the Word from God, then, when we taste It, we have life in ourselves, we too being united with It, as It to the indwelling Word." "The[5] Holy Body of Christ giveth life to those in whom It is, and holdeth

[1] S. Chrys. in S. Matt. 8, 4. Hom. 25, § 5, p. 383, Oxf. Tr.

[2] Id. in S. Matt. 14, 36. Hom. 50, § 3, p. 684.

[3] S. Pet. Chrysol. [72], Serm. 2, de prodig. fil. B. P. vii. 847.

[4] S. Cyr. in S. Joh. 6, 57. L. iv. p. 365.—The same language is ascribed to Victor of Antioch [64], in Cramer's Cat. in Marc. 14, 24, p. 423, and Apollinarius [45] in S. Joh. vi. 52 (Cramer, T. 2, p. 255). "This that He said, 'He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me and I in Him,' showed that He is immingled (ἀνακιρνᾶται) in him."

[5] Id. in S. Joh. vi. 35, L. iii. c. 6, p. 324.

them together in incorruption, being mingled (ἀνακιρνάμενον) with our bodies. For we know it to be the Body of none other than of Him Who is, by Nature, Life, having in itself the whole virtue of the united Word, and qualitied, as it were (πεποιωμένον), yea, rather filled with His mighty working, whereby all things are made alive, and kept in being." "The participation of the Body and Blood of Christ affects nothing else, than that we pass into that we receive[6]." "Not even by 'the mouth of babes' is the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ, among the Sacraments of Communion, unconfessed. For in that mystic distribution of spiritual nourishment this is imparted, this received; that we, receiving the virtue of the heavenly Food, may pass into the Flesh of Himself who was made our Flesh[7]."

To close this list with an encyclical letter of S. Cyril, adopted by the General Council of Ephesus, "We approach to the Eucharist and are sanctified, having partaken of the Holy Flesh, and the precious Blood of Christ, the Saviour of us all; and receiving it not as common flesh, God forbid! but as truly life-giving, and the own Flesh of the Word Himself. For He, as God, being by nature, Life, when He became one with His Flesh, made it life-giving. So that though He say to us, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood,' we shall not account it as the

[6] S. Leo [61], Serm. 63 [de Pass. 12], fin. p. 247.

[7] Id. Ep. 59, ad cler. et pleb. Const. c. 2, p. 977.

flesh of one of us; (for how shall the Flesh of a man be, by its own nature, life-giving?) but as having become truly the own Flesh of Him, Who, for us, became, and was called, the Son of Man[8]."

The prayers of the ancient Church agree with and express her teaching. "The rule of prayer forms the rule of faith[9]". The transmitted prayers of the Church hold in life and being her transmitted faith. The ancient Liturgies, wherein they agree[1], express one origin of the Christian worship throughout the world; and that origin, in its substance, from the Apostles, and so from God. Yet in every way they do, with one harmony of prayer (whether for the Gift itself, or that the soul may be made meet for that Gift), of confession, of belief, or of thanksgiving, express the doctrine of the real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. They pray that "the[2] Holy Spirit would

[8] S. Cyril et Synod. Alex. ad Nestor. c. 7, in Conc. Eph. P. 1. c. 26. Conc. T. iii. p. 951, ed. Col. (quoted Decr. de Consecr. D. 2, c. 80.)

[9] "Ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi." Cælest. 1, Ep. 1, ad Episc. Gall. Conc. iii. 475.

[1] See the arguments drawn out in Tracts for the Times, No. 63, on the Antiquity of the existing Liturgies; and in Archdn. Wilberforce, "Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," c. 3.

[2] S. Cyril Jerus. Cat. Myst. v. 7, p. 275, Oxf. Tr. Lit. S. Jacob. (Assem. Cod. Lit. v. 40.) S. Marc. (Assem. vii. 35.) S. Basil (Ib. 59, 60). S. Gregory (Ib. p. 106, 7). S. Chrysostom. (λειτουργ., α, p. νη; β, p. μγ; γ, p. ξα. ed. Ven. 1644.) S. Cyril (p. 183). The Roman Canon has a corresponding prayer before the consecration, "Quam oblationem Tu, Deus, in

make this Bread the Body, and this Cup the Blood of the New Testament of our Lord God and Saviour and Sovereign King, Jesus Christ." Or they confess, "the Holy Body, and precious, very, Blood of Jesus Christ, Son of God, Amen. The Holy, Precious Body and very Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, and confess to my last breath, that this is the life-giving Flesh of Thy Only-Begotten Son, our Lord and God, and Saviour Jesus Christ, Amen[3]." Or for themselves they pray that they "may without condemnation partake of the Holy Body and Precious Blood for the remission of sin and life eternal[4]." In thanksgiving they pray that "the Communion of the Holy Body and Precious Blood of the Only-Begotten Son may be to faith unashamed, love unfeigned, fulness of holiness, repulse of the adversary, fulfilment of the Commandment, provision by the way to life eternal, an acceptable defence at the fearful judgment-seat of Jesus Christ[5];" or "that we who

omnibus benedictam, ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Fili tui Domini Dei nostri J. C.," which the Author of the de Sacram. (iv. 5. 21, ap. S. Ambr. ii. 371) includes in the formula of Consecration. Add Mabillon, Miss. Franc. p. 327, and also Miss. Goth. 202. 208. 228. 301. Mone Missen, p. 19. 21, 22. Sacram. Leon. Opp. S. Leon. T. ii. p. 150, ed. Baller.

[3] Lit. S. Basil, Assem. vii. 77, 78. S. Gregory, Ib. p. 128.

[4] Lit. S. James, Ass. v. 57.

[5] Lit. of S. Mark, Ass. vii. p. 41, 42 (a prayer adopted by Bp. Andrewes); add. Lit. of St. James, Ass. v. 59.

have[6] spiritually received the most Holy Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, being stripped of carnal sins, may attain to be made spiritual[7]."

Christ redeems us not, my younger brethren, to part with us. He cometh not to us, to part from us; He cometh to abide with us, if we will have Him. He will come to us in holiness, righteousness, sanctification, redemption, if we will long for Him,—if in faith and charity we will receive Him. He will cleanse your dross, slake your feverishness, chase away foul thoughts, re-create your decay, drive off Satan, gather you up into Himself. He will strengthen you against temptation, lift you up above those miserable, maddening, seducing pleasures of sense, and give you a foretaste of heavenly sweetness, of blissful calm, of spiritual joy, of transporting love, of unearthly delight, in His own ever-blessed, ever-blessing Presence. Martyrs of old went to their last conflict "fortified," S. Cyprian[8] says, "with the protection of the Body and Blood of Christ." By His Body and Blood will Christ prepare *you* for

[6] Mabillon, Missal. Goth. p. 192 (Post-Communion); add Ib. p. 190. 293. 297. 300; Miss. Gall. Vet. p. 331. 347.

[7] This paragraph upon the liturgies, as well as many of the preceding extracts from the Fathers, were omitted in preaching, for want of time; but those passages were delivered which presented the same truth in a variety of ways, and no way of expressing the doctrine was omitted.

[8] Council under S. Cyprian to Cornel. Ep. 56, § 1, p. 138, Oxf. Tr.

your conflict. Satan stands in awe of you. "If they," says S. Chrysostom, "who touched the hem of His garment, drew from Him such great virtue, how much more they who possess Him wholly[9]?" "Ask," he says, "even the devil himself, whence hast thou that incurable wound? whence hast thou no longer any strength? whence art thou captive? wherewith wert thou taken in thy flight? Nought else will he say than this, The Body which was crucified[1]!" "As to approach carelessly is peril, so not to partake of that mystical Feast is famine and death. For this Table is the nerve of our soul, the band of our thought, the foundation of our confidence, our hope, our salvation, our light, our life[2]."

Christ dwells in us in a twofold way, spiritually and sacramentally. By His Spirit, He makes us the temples of God; by His Body and Blood, He is to our bodies also a source of life, incorruption, immortality. "Ye are the temples of the Holy Ghost." As you would reverence the Church of God, so and much more reverence yourselves as His Temples. As you would reverence the Holy Sepulchre, so and yet more reverence yourselves, your own bodies, which, our Church says, have been "made clean by His Body, and washed with His most Precious Blood." Reverence, beforehand, your souls and bodies. If ye believe Christ and His Word, ye know that, when ye do come to the Holy Eucharist,

[9] In S. Matt. Hom. 50, § 3, p. 683, Oxf. Tr.

[1] Id. in 1 Cor. x. 24, Hom. 24, n. 7, p. 333, O. T.

[2] Ib. § 8, p. 335.

ye come to the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Were He Himself visibly present, and ye to come into His Presence, ye would not, just before ye came into His Presence, defile your imaginations, or, whether men know of it or no (ye whom it concerns, know what I mean), first fever your own frames, and then, in a way which Christ forbids and hates, remove that feverishness.

"These things thou doest," says S. Chrysostom[3], "when thou hast enjoyed the Table of Christ, on that day on which thou hast been counted worthy to touch His Flesh with thy tongue. Whosoever thou art then, that those things be not so, do thou purify thy right hand, thy tongue, thy lips, which have become a threshold for Christ to tread on. I beseech you that we do not this to condemnation. Let us nourish Christ; let us give Him to drink; let us clothe Him. These things are worthy of that Table. Hast thou heard holy hymns? Hast thou seen a spiritual marriage? Hast thou enjoyed a royal Table? Hast thou been filled with the Holy Ghost? Hast thou joined in the choir of the Seraphim? Hast thou become partaker of the power above? Cast not away so great a joy; waste not the treasure; bring not in drunkenness, the mother of dejection, the joy of the devil, the parent of countless evils."

How can ye pray Him "to whom all hearts are open," to cleanse your thoughts by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit, and then admit into your souls, the

[3] Ib. Hom. 27, n. 7, p. 381, O. T.

very dwelling-place of God, thoughts hateful to God, and, when ye come to yourselves, to yourselves also? He has made you, He says, "members" of Himself, "of His Flesh, and of His Bones." He comes to dwell in you. Ye will not then utter, with lips which belong to Christ, words of profaneness, or of refined or coarse indecency, which ye would be shocked to utter in your parent's presence. Ye will not use the Word of God for display of some poor but profane cleverness. Ye will not corrupt others, nor add to the corruption of those for whom, with you, Christ died. Ye are not your own; ye are joined to Christ; ye will not profane what is not yours, but Christ's.

Past sin excludes no penitent sinner from any nearness to Christ. Present weakness or sickness hinders none from coming to the Physician of Life. We come to the Physician, not because we are whole, but because we are sick. But ye must not come to this immediate Presence of Christ, the Church tells you, without "true repentance for past sins, and a steadfast purpose to lead a new life." Ye must not return "from the sky to the sty[4]." To what end to pretend again and again to desire that the soul should be washed in Christ's precious Blood, and then ever anew to return to the "wallowing in the mire? To what end, against God's Word, first to "drink the Cup of the Lord," and then "the Cup of devils?" And what else is it than to drink the

[4] "A cœlo ad cœnum." Tert. de Spect. § 25, p. 214, Oxf. Tr.

Cup of devils, to be giddy with the fumes of passion, to be out of yourselves, to lose control over yourselves, to do in feverish haste what God forbids, what defiles yourselves, what ye are forthwith ashamed of, and hate, and would gnash with your teeth that ye had done?

And what are ye yourselves, my brethren, who do these things? What are ye wasting in yourselves? God, the Word, became Flesh, to redeem you. He, the Only-Begotten Son of God, for you made Man, giveth Himself to you to dwell in you, and make you one with Him. This He does for you in time, while you are yet in this clay, absent from Him, seeing Him not, save by the eye of faith; touching Him with the hands of the heart, and if ye will, ye, by that inner touch, "taste and see that the Lord is gracious." What must be your value in the sight of God, that for you God the Father should have given His Only-Begotten Son; for you, Christ, God and man, died! You He would knit as closely to Himself, as the food of the body is united with the body. If such be the earnest, what will be the fulness? If such are the rays of His love, seen through a glass darkly, what when we see "face to face?" If such be the closeness of union when you are absent from the Lord, what when ye are "present" and "dissolved, and are with Chirst?" If this be the gift of His goodness to you in "this body of death," when "the corruptible body presseth down the soul," what when your body too shall be spiritual,

conformed to His glorious Body, which is glorious with the Glory of the Father, the In-dwelling Godhead, Light Unapproachable!

"The Holy Eucharist is," the Homilies[5] say, "the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death, a deifical Communion, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life." It has then a heavenly sweetness, the foretaste of the eternal, against the destructive sweetness of this world's pleasures. It has sweetness, because Christ is sweet to the soul; it is "healthful grace," because Christ is our health, and the Author of Grace; it is the "defence of faith," because Christ is "the Author and Finisher of our faith;" it is "the Food of immortality, and the hope of the Resurrection, the pledge of eternal health, and the sovereign preservative against death," because Christ is all these, and all besides; "our Redemption and Salvation," "the Resurrection and the Life."

Wait but a little, pray your Redeemer for endurance, and all ye long for ye shall have, not against the will of God, but from His Love and the fulness of His Good Pleasure. Then for these feverish pleasures, ye shall be filled and overflowed with the torrent of His pleasure; then, for maddening joys,

[5] Second Part of the Sermon upon the Sacraments.

ye shall enter into, be immersed in, the joy of your own Lord. Then shall your soul be irradiated with the light of Divine Wisdom, your mind be enlightened with Divine knowledge, your body be clothed with the glory of God, wherewith ye shall be encompassed. Then shall ye gaze unceasingly on Beauty which eye hath not seen,—the Face of God. The Brightness of His Glory, and the Infinity of His Love, and the Unchangeableness of His joy, and the hidden treasures of His Knowledge, and His Incomprehensible Essence, shall be in your measure apprehended by you. Then shall all truth be open to you, all love shall fill you; soul and body shall be satisfied with His likeness; they shall rest in His love; they shall have all they long for, and long for all they have. All you long for, shall be for ever yours; for the All Holy Trinity shall be for ever yours; the glorified Humanity of your Lord shall be for ever yours; and meanwhile, if you pray Him to cleanse His dwelling-place, your soul, He will cleanse it. He will empty it of what is not His; He will fill it with what is His; He will fill it with His Grace, fill you with Himself, the Author of Grace, as He saith, "If a man love Me, he will keep My saying, and My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make our abode in him." Amen.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

Justification.

A SERMON

PREACHED BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY AT S. MARY'S,

ON THE

24TH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, 1853,

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

"Love the truth and peace."—*Zech.* viii. 19.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

M DCCC LIII.

A SERMON.

S. James ii. 22.

Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

Go where you will, and ask what Christian or what body of Christians you will, what is the source of their justification in the sight of God? and they will all answer with one voice, "We are justified for the sake of the merits of Christ Jesus our Lord, alone, not for our own works or deservings[a]." Ask them again, "Can man of his own natural strength and good works, turn and prepare himself to faith and calling upon God[b]?" All would alike answer, "God forbid that we should so disparage the grace of God as to think so!" Ask them again, "Can we do good works pleasing and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing, co-operating, perfecting[c]?" All would answer, "It were heresy to think so." Or, "Although Christ died for all, is any justified who is not born again in Christ?" All would say, "He is not justified[d]." Or again, "Do

[a] Art. XI. [b] Art. X. [c] Ibid.

[d] Conc. Trid. de Justif., c. 3. "But, though 'He died for all,' yet do

works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit, make men meet to receive grace[d]?" All would say, "They do not." Or further, "Can man, without the grace of God, of his own free-will, move himself towards righteousness in His sight[e]?" All will say, "He is not able." "Is man then called without any merits on his own part?" All will say, "Not through works

not all receive the benefit of His death; but those only, unto whom the merit of His Passion is communicated. For as in truth men, if they were not born propagated from the seed of Adam, would not be born unrighteous; whereas, by that propagation, they through him contract, when they are conceived, unrighteousness of their own; so, unless they were born again in Christ, they would never be justified; seeing that by that new birth there is bestowed upon them, through the merit of His Passion, the grace whereby they are made just. For this benefit the Apostle exhorts us evermore 'to give thanks to the Father, Who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, and hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, in Whom we have redemption, and remission of sins.'"

[d] Art. XIII.

[e] Conc. Trid. de Justif., c. 5. "It declares further that, in adults, the beginning of justification itself is to be derived from the preventing grace of God, through Christ Jesus, that is to say, from His calling, by which, without any merits of theirs existing, they are called; that so they, who through sins were turned away from God, may, through His quickening and assisting grace, be in such wise disposed to turn themselves unto their own justification, by freely assenting to, and co-operating with that same grace, that, while God toucheth the heart of man by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, man himself is not wholly inactive, in that he receives that inspiration, (forasmuch as he is also able to reject it) and yet is he not able, without the grace of God, of his own free-will to move himself unto righteousness in His sight. Whence, when it is said in Holy Scripture, 'Turn ye unto Me, and I will turn unto you,' we are admonished of our freedom; when we answer, 'Turn Thou us, O Lord, unto Thee, and we shall be turned,' we confess that we are prevented by the grace of God."

of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He hath saved us." "But has man then the power, through the quickening and assisting grace of God, to obey that will, or by his own perverse will to reject it?" All will say, "He draweth us with the cords of a man, through our wills and our affections, not without or against them." Or further, "Are sins, or have sins ever been remitted, save freely, by the Divine mercy, for Christ's sake[f]?" All will say, "The Blood of Christ alone cleanseth us from all sins." Or again, "Does an historical faith justify, whereby people intellectually or speculatively believe the truths of God, without love for God, or trust in God, or obedience to Him?" All will say, "With the heart man believeth unto salvation." Faith without love is the faith of devils. And yet all will agree that even this historical faith, whereby the mind assents to the word of God, and the doctrines therein taught by God, even while the life is at variance with the belief, is a gift of God, enlightening the mind, and that it is man's own exceeding fault that it avails not to him to salvation.

Further, all will agree, as matter of undoubted faith, that justifying faith must include in itself the belief in all the Articles of the Christian Faith, as far as any may attain to know them, and more

[f] Ib., c. 9. "But, although it be necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted, nor ever have been remitted, save *freely*, by the Divine mercy for Christ's sake."

especially in the merits of Christ, in Whom we are accepted. All will assent that to believe in God is by believing to love Him, by believing to cleave to Him, by believing to go into Him, and to be incorporated in His members[e].

Again, all will hold that in this living, justifying faith, there is, (at least in a healthy state of the soul,) combined a trustful hope or confidence in God[f], whereby we believe that our sins shall be forgiven us for the sake of Christ, that we ourselves are children of God, adopted through His grace, and that He Who hath loved us so as to make us His, will, unless we forsake Him, love us unto the end.

And yet all believe that this justifying faith does not justify us by any quality of its own, but simply brings us to God, Who, of His own free bounty and love, justifies those who believe in Him, and who,

[e] S. Aug. in S. Joh. Hom. 29. § 6. p. 441. Oxf. Tr., quoted Sent. L. 3, dist. 23.

[f] The place given to "fiducia" in reformed writers is well known. But the Council of Trent also acknowledges it as entering into the preparation for justification, De Justif. c. 6. "They are disposed unto that same righteousness, when, quickened and assisted by Divine grace, conceiving 'faith by hearing,' they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which have been revealed and promised by God; and this especially, that the ungodly is justified of God 'by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.' And when, understanding themselves to be sinners, they, through the fear of the justice of God, whereby they are beneficially shaken, turning themselves to consider the mercy of God, are raised unto hope, *trusting that God will be propitious to them for Christ's sake*, and they begin to love Him as the fountain of all righteousness, and are therefore moved by a certain hatred and detestation against sin."

being drawn by Him, hold not back from Him, but come unto Him by Whom they have been called and drawn.

And with, or in, this faith, there must be other qualities, besides the one quality of belief; such as those involved in true repentance; some sorrow for the love of God that we ever offended Him; hatred of the sins whereby we offended Him, and stedfast purpose to forsake them; fear of His judgments; hope of His pardoning mercy. Or, if any prefer so to call it, the faith whereby we are justified, must be a penitent, humble, self- or sin-abhorring, trustful, loving, earnest faith, given to us and produced in us by the grace of God.

To those who so come to God, not with *any* faith or belief, but with this penitent, humble, loving faith, it is (all agree) part of the wisdom and good pleasure of God to forgive their sins, to make them members of Christ, and therewith to give them the earnest or first-fruits of the Spirit; which gifts He does not give to those who come not to Him, or who come to Him unsubmissively or feignedly, as Simon Magus, withholding from Him the full submission of the understanding, or the entireness of their obedience, or halving their affections between Him and Mammon.

Further, all agree that God, in justifying us, not only *declares* us, but *makes* us, righteous. He does not declare us to be that which He does not make us. He makes us that which we *were* not, but

which now, if we are in Him, (whatever there still remain of inward corruption,) we by His gift are, holy. He does not give us an untrue, unreal, nominal, shadowy righteousness; or He does not impute to us *only* a real outward righteousness, "the righteousness of God in Christ;" for which, being unrighteous still, we are to be accounted righteous. But what He imputes, that He also imparts. He creates in us an inchoate and imperfect, yet still a real and true righteousness; inchoate and imperfect, because "we all," while in the flesh, "in many things offend;" yet real and true, because it is the gift of God, and the first-fruits of His Holy Spirit.

This righteousness, being imperfect, even although the fruit in us of God's Holy Spirit, cannot (all agree) stand the strict judgment of God, if God were to judge without mercy. And yet, since it is real and sincere and true in the judgment of God Himself, He, "the righteous Judge," will own it at the Great Day in those who are found sanctified in Him. He Who, not without our will, but through our new-created and invigorated will, "wrought all our works in us[g]," will "crown in us His own gift," which He gave, and which He guarded in us.

[g] S. Aug. Ep. 194 ad Sixt. § 19: "What desert then has man before grace through which desert he may receive grace, when nothing but grace produceth in us any good desert of ours, and when God crowns our desert, He crowns nothing else than His own gifts? For as, from the beginning, we obtained the mercy of faith, not because we were faithful, but that we should be so, so in the end, wherein shall be life eter-

This righteousness, again, (all agree,) is maintained and enlarged by faithfulness in using the grace of God, and thereby doing good works acceptable to God in Jesus Christ; as, equally, through neglect of that grace, and through deadly sin, faith itself decays, and although it may, by the grace of God, yet be revived, is for the time (as it was in David) dead.

Now since all Christians are thus far agreed, since we all believe that whoever has been, or will be, accepted by God, has been or will be accepted for the sake of Christ alone; that whatever good there is in any one, is through the grace of God in Christ; that man's best works could not stand the severity of God's judgment; that by faith (itself the gift of God) we come to Him, and through faith in Him we abide in Him; yet that good works done by the

nal, He will crown us, as is written, 'in mercy and loving-kindness.'" Serm. 295. § 5: "Thou [Paul] hast fought the good fight. But who caused thee to prevail? I read thee to thee and thou sayest, 'I thank my God Who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ.' What will it avail to have fought, if it avail not to overcome? Therefore thou hast, that thou hast fought, but Christ gave the victory. Continue, 'I have finished my course.' And who did this in thee? Hast thou not said, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy?' Say what follows, 'I have kept the faith.' And whence hadst thou this? Hear thine own words, 'I obtained mercy, that I should be faithful.' So then thou hast kept the faith out of the mercy of God, not out of thine own strength. 'Henceforth there is laid up for thee a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall render thee in that day.' For He shall render to deserts, therefore He is a just Judge. But here too let not thy head be lifted up, for thy merits are His gifts. What I have said to him [S. Paul] I learned from him, and ye too learned with me in that school."

grace of Christ, are (when they can be performed) essential to a living faith, and necessary to our salvation, how is it that persons, members of the same Church, living by the same faith in the Son of God, having the same hope in Him, can speak, the one of the other, as though they were heathen or apostates, "preaching another gospel," teaching another source of righteousness, than "Christ our Righteousness," or substituting this or that for faith in Christ? How is it that, even as to those who are severed in Communion from us, men do not try to understand all things in their best sense, and seem more eager to catch at an argument against them, than patiently to understand their meaning?

Now in order to understand the meaning of others, 1. We should begin, not with that which is seemingly most at variance with our own thoughts, but with that which we believe in common. It should not be a weariness to us to ascertain or bring to our minds, that both of us hold the first simple principles of faith in common, and from that point of view to contemplate whatever perplexes us in the other. We should not argue from language uncongenial to our own way of thinking, that a person denies the very basis of our common faith; but, having ascertained that he does hold those first principles, we should see whether the language which is uncongenial to us, may not be explained in harmony with those principles. We should argue from what is clear and known to us, as to what is at

present unknown to us; not, through that which is unknown to us, interpret and explain away what is simple and clear.

2. We should look carefully what those to whom we seem to be opposed, are themselves opposing. This we must needs do as to doctrines of Holy Scripture itself. When S. Paul says, "a man is justified by faith without the works of the law[h];" and S. James says, "ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only[i];" we know that both must be true, "because the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Again, when S. James says, "will faith save him?" no one supposes him to mean that a living faith does not save him. Or if Daniel speak, that "they who justify many, shall shine as the stars for ever and ever[k];" no one plainly would say that he ascribed to the servant the office of the Redeemer. Or when Isaiah says, "by knowledge of Him, shall My Righteous Servant justify many[l];" we do not suppose that it is through knowledge, apart from faith and love, that they shall be justified. Or when S. Peter says, "Baptism saves us[m]," we do not say that he puts the Sacraments instead of Christ, the Author of Sacraments. Or when he says, "I am made all things to all men, that by all means I might save some[n];" "in so doing thou shalt both save thyself

[h] Rom. iii. 28.
[i] S. James ii. 24.
[k] Dan. xii. 3.
[l] Isaiah liii. 11.
[m] 1 Pet. iii. 21.
[n] 1 Cor. ix. 22.

and them that hear thee[o];" we do not say, Who can save, but God only?

I do not mean that uninspired man ought to use the same fearlessness of speech as the unerring wisdom of God. But I do mean, that we are bound to seek to understand one another, not to speak against one another without being sure that we *do* understand what we speak against; and that these seeming contradictions of Holy Scripture may have, besides their other uses, this too, to teach us the duty of interpreting one another's speech, not by what in itself any language *may* mean, but as what it *must* mean, if it is to be consistent with the known belief of him who uses it.

Language, apparently very different, may be but different phases or aspects of the same truth. Thus, if one says that "concupiscence, even in the regenerate, hath *the nature of* sin[p]," it is clear that he does not mean that it *is* "sin," else he would have said it. If another denies that "it is in the regenerate *truly and properly* sin, but that the Apostle calls it sin, because it is from sin and inclines to sin[q]," he plainly means that it has something "of the nature of sin" about it, else he would not have confined himself to the denial that it is "*truly and properly* sin." Both, combined, declare the full truth, that this concupiscence "hath the nature of sin," and yet is not truly and properly sin to those

[o] 1 Tim. iv. 16. [p] Art. IX.
[q] Conc. Trid. sess. v. c. 5.

who consent not in will to it. The one increases our humility; the other, our hope.

Again, when our Article declares that "we are accounted righteous before God, only *for* the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by* faith, not *for* our own works and deservings[r]," (*propter meritum* Domini ac servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, non *propter* opera *merita* nostra,) it is clear that it contrasts our own works and merits with the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It does not directly contrast faith and works. On the other hand, if any were to say that "the ungodly is justified by faith only, *in the sense* that nothing else is required to co-operate, to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is in no part necessary that he should be prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will[s]," this is virtually rejected by our own Church also, in that she states "faith and repentance" to be, in adults, prerequisites for the grace of Baptism.

Again, if any deny that "man is justified either by the *sole* imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or by the *sole* remission of sins, *excluding grace and love*, which is shed abroad in their hearts through the Holy Spirit[t]," Bishop Davenant allows as much when he says, "We do not fight against inherent righteousness, inasmuch as we allow that such a quality is infused in the act of justifying[u]."

[r] Art. XI.
[s] rejected by Conc. Trid., ib. can. 9.
[t] rejected Ib., can. 11.
[u] De Justif. habit., c. 25.

Again, to deny that "justifying faith is *nothing else than* a confidence in the Divine mercy, remitting sins for Christ's sake," does not exclude that confidence from entering into justifying faith, only from being the whole of it[x].

Again, such propositions as "that man is absolved from sins and justified, *thereby* that he certainly believes that he *is* absolved and justified, or that no one is truly justified save he who believes that he *is* justified, and that absolution and justification are perfected by *this* faith alone[y]," are only Lutheran statements[z] which the framers of our Articles carefully excluded.

[x] Conc. Trid., l. c. can. 12.

[y] Ib., can. 14. This is worded in can. 13, "If any say, that it is necessary to every man for the obtaining remission of sins, that he should believe assuredly and without any hesitation from his own infirmity and indisposition, that his sins are forgiven him."

[z] This definition of justifying faith occurs six times in the Confession of Augsburg. Art. 4, on Justification, "They teach, that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits or works, but that they are justified freely for the sake of (propter) Christ by faith, *when they believe that they are received into grace, and that their sins are remitted* for the sake of Christ, Who, by His death, satisfied for our sins *This* faith God imputeth for righteousness before Him." Art. 5. (On the Ministry of the Church.) "Through the word and sacraments, as through instruments, the Holy Spirit is given Who worketh faith, where and when God willeth, in them who hear the Gospel, viz. that God, not on account of our merits, but on account of Christ, *justifies those who believe that they are, for Christ's sake, received into grace.*" Art. 12. (On Repentance.) "The other part [of repentance] is faith, which is conceived from the Gospel or absolution, and *believes that sins are remitted for Christ*, and comforts the conscience and frees from terrors." Art. 13. (On the use of the Sacraments.) "They condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify ex opere operato, and do not teach that in the use of the sacraments faith is required, *which believes that sins are*

Our own Articles, while they state fully and clearly that the good works of the justified are "pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ," have mainly an anti-Pelagian character. To this end, they state the powerlessness of the human will without the preventing and co-operating grace of God; our helplessness to do good without or before the grace of Christ; the insufficiency even of the works of the justified to put away our sins or endure the severity of God's judgments. Their main object is to ascribe every thing, from first to last, to the merit of Christ, and the grace of Christ, for Whose sake alone we are accounted righteous, through Whose grace alone we can do works pleasing and acceptable to God. The canons of the Council of Trent do not oppose or condemn herein any thing which we teach, although their main object is to maintain that man is not justified, without being also sanctified; while it too confesses, with us, that "the meritorious cause of our justification is the most

remitted." Art. 20. "We obtain this [remission of sins, and grace and justification] only by faith, *believing that*, for Christ's sake, *we are* received into grace." "Consciences cannot be tranquillized through any work, but only by faith, *when they hold as certain that for Christ's sake they have God reconciled*."

The exclusions of Lutheran statements from our Articles are more instructive than what we have taken from them.

It occurs also in Calvinist formulæ, as in Calvin's Catechism, faith is defined "a certain persuasion or confidence, which every Christian ought to have, that God the Father loveth *him* for His Son Jesus Christ." See further Le Blanc's peacemaking Theses Theolog. de fid. Justif. p. 192, sqq. The peculiarity of this doctrine is that it makes the belief of *present* personal forgiveness the characteristic of true faith.

beloved only-Begotten Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who when we were enemies, for the great love wherewith He loved us, merited justification for us by His most holy Passion on the wood of the cross, and for us made satisfaction unto God the Father[a]."

3. In judging also of the statements of others, we must give careful heed not only to the design of their meaning, but to the sense, whether exact or popular, in which they use whatever doctrinal words they employ.

Thus, "faith" may be spoken of, as it is an assent to Divine truth, without influencing the will or affections. And this, although a "dead faith," as S. James calls it, still has so much likeness to the living faith, that it is a real, although an uninfluential belief. It is the body, of which the living soul is gone, itself also ready to decay utterly, yet capable of being revived by the Spirit of God. To act wilfully against the grace of God, so far darkens the understanding against the light of God; bribes the will against the belief of the truth of God; closes up the soul against the love of God. It blunts the fineness of the perception, confuses the understanding, and tempts Him, the Author of light and grace, to withdraw the light, against which the eyes are closed, and the grace which the heart will not open to receive. Dead faith, in the end, decays, so that God no longer re-creates or revives it. But for the

[a] Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. de Justif. c. 7.

time, the belief, although sorely sinned against, injured, wounded, mangled, exists still. God does not withdraw His light and leave the soul in darkness at once.

If by "true faith," then, we mean a "living faith," faith which is a grace and virtue, bringing the soul to God, this belief plainly is not such faith. But if by "true faith," any one means only a belief which is really belief, then one cannot deny that a man may believe that there is a God and a Redeemer, a heaven and a hell, although his whole life belies it. For S. James speaks of a dead faith, which yet he calls faith; and he says, that "the devils believe and tremble;" and we see how persons *do* believe the main articles of the faith (happy if ye know it not, or have not known it in yourselves) and yet live contrary to their belief. A man believes, is hurried by passion to do deadly things contrary to faith; yet his very remorse, when they are done, shews that he believes. He really believes, else he would not have remorse; he has not a living faith, else he would not again and again do the deadly sins, from which his loving Lord died to redeem him. So then, in different aspects, as one looked at his belief as being a real belief, a man might call it real faith; or as one looked how he belied it by his life, one might call it a feigned and hypocritical faith[b], as opposed to that "faith unfeigned," which

[b] S. Chrys. in 1 Tim. i. 5. See Stapleton, De Justif. viii. 9.

S. Paul speaks of, as combined with "a pure heart and good conscience," and issuing in love.

Again, God Himself in Holy Scripture uses the word "justify" (as all acknowledge) of two acts of His towards the soul, which with Him are one, 1, to declare the soul righteous or acquit it, and 2, to make it what He declares it. To "justify" is, in what is called a "forensic" sense, to pronounce just, or to acquit. But the word of God is with power. He, by His creative power, brought light out of darkness. He spake and it was done. It was no more darkness but light. So in the act of justifying the sinner, He does not declare the soul holy, leaving it unholy. He does not pronounce the leper clean, veiling over the leprosy, but in himself, and in His own all-holy eyes which "cannot bear to look upon iniquity," leaving him, as before, unclean. But He saith, "I will, be thou clean;" and the leprosy departs, and "the flesh comes again," in the new birth of Him, "like the flesh of a little child." Without and against any merits of its own; without any good desert and against its evil deserts, God declares the soul what it *was* not. The ungodly and unrighteous, the impure and stained with countless sins, He pronounces righteous and godly, His own Son, beloved in the Beloved, pure, unblameable, unreprovable. But God does not contradict Himself. He does not adorn the soul with untrue titles of honour. He does not deck over with the new robe the tattered

and filthy garments of our unrighteousness. But He bids, "Take away the filthy garments from him," and says, "Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment[b]."

It is true that, in Holy Scripture, to justify the sinner often stands opposed to condemning him. But it does not follow that in God's language, to "justify" means no more than to acquit. When the word is limited in its meaning, it is so limited not by the force of the word itself, but by the very nature of things. "They who justify themselves in the sight of men[c]," or, "he willing to justify himself[d]" can only mean (as we too use the words) to make himself *out* just. On the very same ground the word is limited, if used of God in the sight of man. Nothing can be added to God, or the wisdom of God; and so when it is said, "the publicans justified God[e]," or "Wisdom was justified of all her children[f]," or "that Thou mightest be justified in Thy saying[g];" or, of our Lord, "He was justified in or by the Spirit[h];" it *can* only be meant, that God, or our Lord, or the Divine Wisdom, were shewn or owned to be what they *are*, just. Now, on the other hand, man can only justify, whether himself or others, outwardly; and if in this he follows the eternal rules of God's law, he

[b] Zech. iii. 4. [c] S. Luke xvi. 15. [d] Ib., x. 29.
[e] Ibid., vii. 29. [f] Ver. 35. [g] Rom. iii. 4.
[h] 1 Tim. iii. 16.

can only justify himself or others, by shewing that they were in that thing accused falsely, that they are so far just. Even in this judicial sense it means to do justice to, or to make just in man's eyes, in which alone man *can* make just. It was the special offensiveness of judicial injustice, that it was a public lie in the Name of God, in Whose Name judges judged. "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth (literally, makes evil) the just, both are an abomination to the Lord[i]." It is a direct reversal of God's command, "They shall justify the righteous, and shall condemn (make evil) the evil[k]." But the judges did not nakedly set free the wicked, owning him to be wicked; they made him what they could, they made him *out* to be righteous, and the righteous unrighteous; "Woe to them," says the prophet Isaiah, "which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him[l]." As on the contrary, Solomon prays God when appealed to by oath, "Judge Thy servants, condemning the wicked and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness[m]."

So that no place in the Old or New Testament can be alleged in which to "justify," simply means to set free from a charge, without reference to the real or apparent truth of the acquittal.

To "justify" is not to pardon or to have mercy, but

[i] Ps. xvii. 15.
[k] Deut. xxv. 1.
[l] Isa. v. 23.
[m] 1 Kings viii. 32.

to acquit, as just. God, Who can make the unholy holy, and the unrighteous righteous, pronounces the ungodly righteous, while He makes him so. He, by the secret working of His grace, gives the faith whereby we come to Him. We come to Him as sinners; He pronounces us, and pronouncing, He makes us righteous. The mercy of God flows beyond His justice. To "justify," as God's act, corresponds in a way with to "condemn;" but it is not simply "not to condemn." It is more, because our God delighteth in mercy. When He condemneth, He leaveth the evil of the sinner as it was. He declares him what he *was*. He doth not make him, but He leaves him, guilty. When He acquitteth, He declares him what he *was* not, but what He makes him and because He so willeth to make him.

The source of the sinner's acceptance is out of himself. It is not works; it is not faith; it *is* the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. "It is God Who justifieth." The act is wholly His free act. Every thing before justification, faith, repentance, although worked in man by the Spirit of God, only brings him within the compass of God's mercy. God willeth to justify the penitent, not the obdurate; the believing, not the scornful; those who sue to Him for mercy, not the self-satisfied and self-righteous. Yet He justifies, as His own royal act of mercy, not on account of any desert of repentance or faith, but freely. He forgives unrighteousness,

He infuses righteousness, in one act; and by this one act He justifies the ungodly.

This is acknowledged on all hands. All acknowledge that we are, in the first instance, "justified freely[n]," i. e. "without any deserts of our's either preceding or following faith[o]." All acknowledge equally that in the act of our justification, there is infused into us a new hallowing grace. "All our people," says Bp. Davenant[p], "no less than the pontificals themselves, teach that an inherent righteousness is infused into the justified, and a grace of sanctification, which is the root of a new life." And further, "By inherent righteousness we understand a supernatural gift of sanctifying grace, opposed to original sin, and, in each faculty of the soul, repairing and renewing that image of God, which was defiled and defaced by original sin. Original sin filled the mind with darkness; this infused grace illumines it with heavenly light. That stained the human heart with obstinacy and hatred of God and God's law; this infused righteousness softens the heart, and kindles and inflames it with love of good. That infected all the affections with disorder, and the very appetite with rebellion; this renewed holiness brings into order the disturbed affections, and spoils of its dominion the very rebel concupiscence, and brings it under the yoke. And when I say, that from *this* [inherent] righteousness the regenerated are named

[n] Rom. iii. 24.

[o] Corn. à Lap. ad loc.

[p] Disp. de habit. just., c. 2.

and accounted righteous, I mean, that God Himself, Who judgeth truly, discerns and distinguishes those on whom He hath impressed this new image of holiness and righteousness, from the carnal and unregenerate; and that *those* He names and accounts ungodly, impure, held under sin, these holy, just, and dead to sin. Not that this infused holiness, or inherent righteousness, is perfect; but that it is true and no wise hypocritical, known and pleasing to God, Who infused it into the minds of the regenerate."

But since it is thus believed by all, that the gifts which God bestows, He bestows of His own sovereign grace; not on the ground of any past or foreseen merit of him whom He justifies; and again, that God when He pronounces any one just, at the same time by the infusion of His grace, makes him what He pronounces him; then it is a mere question of words, not affecting any doctrine, whether the word "justify" as expressing God's act, or "justification" as the result of that act, be used, in Dr. Barrow's words, of the simple or compound act of God respecting or terminated upon man[q].

Yet whereas S. Paul at times uses the word justify, justification, when speaking prominently of our state of favour or acceptance with God, yet at other times he too uses it of the inward change wrought by God on those whom He accepts. Any one, indeed, probably will admit, that when S. Paul

[q] Sermon 5. on the Creed, t. iv. p. 116.

denies that we are justified by our works, he means to deny that we, through our works, become just or holy in God's sight. When the Jews "went about to establish their own righteousness[r]," they wished to establish that they were, through their own works, righteous before God. When as opposed to this, S. Paul asserts, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight[s];" he meant to say that no human being, by nature, hath or can have that righteousness. To be "justified freely by His grace," in contrast with this, signifies surely to have that righteousness, which of ourselves we cannot have. *δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν* is the adequate repeal of the *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται*. In the one it was asserted that we can have no righteousness of our own; the other then surely says that we have it freely through the grace of God. "The righteousness of God," says S. Augustine, "is manifest, not that whereby God is just, but that wherewith He clothes or endues man when He justifies the ungodly[t]."

Again, when S. Paul denied that even the patriarch Abraham was "justified by works as pertaining to the flesh[u];" i. e. in his state by nature, he means that Abraham himself had no righteousness before God, by which, although just before man, he should be really righteous in the sight of God. When then in contrast to this, he speaks of Abra-

[r] Rom. x. 3.
[s] Ibid., iii. 20.
[t] De Spir. et lit., c. 9.
[u] Rom. iv. 2.

ham's "believing Him Who justifieth the ungodly[x]," he must mean that Abraham believed in Him Who gave him that, which by his works before grace he could not obtain. ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη could not be; and so he had recourse to τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ. Yet surely the Apostle's argument is, that he obtained from God's favour all that, which of himself he could not have, not an imputed only, but an imparted righteousness.

Again, "he that is dead is freed or justified (δεδικαίωται) from sin[y];" clearly is in a hallowed state, freed from its unholiness as from its guilt. It could not be said of one who died in his sins, of Cain, or Saul, or Judas, that he "was freed or justified from sin."

Again, when he says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that having been justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life[z];" he combines Baptism, the new birth,

[x] Rom. iv. 5. [y] Ibid., vi. 7.

[z] Tit. iii. 5, 6. See more fully on this text the writer's "Scriptural doctrine of Holy Baptism," p. 54—64. The writer's object in that volume was to draw out the meaning of Holy Scripture on this doctrine. Even Calvin admits, "The context seems to require that the name justification should be extended further than to the imputation of righteousness, in which sense it is found, as I said, rarely in Paul. But nothing hinders that it *may* be restrained to the remission of sins." Beza adopts the same meaning, both for this place and Rom. viii. 30.

renewal by the Holy Ghost, and justification, all in one single act; and he does not speak of our justification until he had declared our regeneration and renewal by the Holy Ghost. Justification, then, *could* not be a mere outward declaration, since in one and the same act man was justified, regenerated, renewed.

Again, in his triumphant words of our deliverance, "such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God[a];" it is plainly no mere outward act, since it is united with Baptism, spoken of subsequently to sanctification, and wrought through the agency of God the Holy Ghost.

Nor less in that chain of Divine mercies, from the good purpose of our God to our final glory, "Whom He hath predestined, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified[b]," it has been felt to be unnatural to conceive that, between our calling and our glorifying, no act of God should be mentioned, but one, (if it were so,) merely outward.

ii. As the first act of God's love in justifying us is two-fold: 1. forgiving, 2. hallowing; so, "since in many things we all offend," we have need of both

[a] 1 Cor. vi. 11. Paræus owns this sense. Bp. W. Forbes, Consid. Modestæ de Justif. ii. 4, (p. 152. ed. Angl. Cath. Lib.) quotes on the same side Zanchius and Bullinger. On the rendering in the past, "Ye *were* washed," see Scriptural Doctrine of Holy Baptism, p. 157—172.

[b] Rom. viii. 30.

to the end. To the end, our Lord has taught us to pray always for daily bread of life, and daily forgiveness; to the end, and in the end, our Father to Whom we pray, continually pardons, continually pours in His grace into our souls; and in both ways upholds us in that state of justification, in which He placed us.

And as on our part a saving faith is "a faith that worketh by love," so continued justification cannot be without faith and works. We are justified antecedently to works; yet future obedience by the grace of God is (if there be time) virtually contained in the faith which justifies. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness;" yet his belief would not have been so counted, had he not, with the belief, purposed to obey. He was called as a sinner; yet when called, "by faith he obeyed." God poured into his soul at once the gifts of faith and love and obedience. Not for works antecedent to faith, did He save him; yet not for one instant did the faith exist without works, in purpose first, in effect, as soon as possible. Works of grace are faith and love in act. Abraham's faith, which was accounted to him for righteousness, was a faith working by love. He received the blessing not on a bare or naked faith, but on a faith which issued in obedience. Almighty God Himself saith to him, "by Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son,

in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; *because* thou hast obeyed My voice[b]." Such too was the faith by which Abel and Enoch, Noah and Moses, the patriarchs and the prophets, pleased God. "By faith" the elders obtained a good report; yet S. Paul speaks throughout of nothing but deeds of faith. "By faith," says S. Paul, one after another of that goodly army, they did those deeds for which, done through the grace of God, they won the praise of God. By faith, they "wrought righteousness." By deeds of faith, did "Noah become heir of the righteousness which is by faith." A deed of faith "was counted to Phinehas for righteousness unto all generations, for evermore[c]," i. e. not only for this world, but also for the world to come. By a deed of faith was "Rahab the harlot," S. James says, "justified[d]." She had not repented when the spies came; for Scripture says, "they came into a harlot's house, named Rahab[e]." She believed before: "The Lord your God, He is God in heaven above, and in the earth beneath." God converted her through the coming of the spies, and quickened her belief into faith, and her faith lived through works. She "was justified by works," S. James says, "when she had received the messengers and sent them out another way."

Faith and works are one compound whole, even as in man, in whom they exist, body and soul are one living man. Faith is first in order of relation;

[b] Gen. xxii. 16. [c] Ps. cvi. 31. [d] ii. 25. [e] Jos. ii. 1.

but since, as our Lord says, the purpose of the heart is an inward act, faith is not for a moment separate from action. S. Paul's "Who art Thou, Lord?" was followed up at once with "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" His whole life of toil and suffering lay, in purpose, in that first confession of his faith. His faith, his love, his devotedness entered into his soul in one.

Faith and deeds of faith are, both of them, graces of this passing world. Yet God hath appointed that not only shall they be inseparable, but that they shall strengthen one another. "Faith," S. James says, "wrought with or co-operated with (συνήργει) Abraham's works, and by works was faith made perfect" (ἐτελειώθη). S. James like S. Paul speaks of faith as the root; "faith co-operated with his works." Faith made them what they became, "pleasing and acceptable to God." But the works re-acted on the faith, and "made it perfect." God has so made us, that acts are the great means of influencing our inward minds. Thoughts and feelings, of themselves, die away; words, the more evaporate them; acts concentrate and give them an intensity of strength. To act lovingly increases love, softens unlove; to act trustfully, increases trust; to act suspiciously, aggravates suspicion; to act unkindly, embitters the unkindness. Acts strengthen the inward feeling, both because, on the neglect or the use of the grace of God, God withdraws or increases His grace; and because, our life

here being in action and duty, God has seen good so to act upon our souls for good, so to allow us to act upon our own souls for evil. But for good or for evil, man, through his own choice, does most energetically stamp the character of his acts upon his soul. Faith grows with deeds of faith. Faith is the root of the living tree; through faith, as the root, the mustard seed grows and becometh a tree: faith draws in nourishment to it from the dew of heaven, and twines around the rifted Rock; but with the growth of the tree, the root itself grows. So faith from first to last unites us to our Lord; faith is the channel of every grace to the soul; yet faith itself is strengthened by the very acts of which it is the spring.

God teaches us this in that great pattern of faith, the type of the Church, the father of the faithful. His life is a succession of trials of faith, mounting and rising above one another[f], until they close in

[f] "Otherwise doth God tempt, otherwise the Devil. The Devil tempts, that he may overthrow; God tempts, that He may crown. Then too He tempts those approved to Him. Whence David too says, 'Prove me, O God, and try [tenta] me.' And holy Abraham He proved first and so tried; lest, if He should try before He proved him, He should overbear him. He proved him, when He bade him depart from Charan, and found him obedient. He proved him, when relying on the title of faith, he freed his nephew; when he touched nothing of the prey; when to the old man He promised a son; and when he was 100 years old, although he supposed Sarah's womb dead, yet he believed and did not hesitate in faith, who might have hesitated, for the barrenness or old age; He proved him by the diligence of his hospitality. When then he was proved, He judged that as being now stronger, he was to be tried in greater ways, and by some harder commands." S. Ambros. de Abr. i. 8. § 66.

that which was the picture of Calvary. He went out, not knowing whither he went; he abandoned the promised land to Lot, content, as a pilgrim in his own land, to wait for his more enduring inheritance; he refused this world's wealth from those who displeased God[g]. Ten years he waited for God's promise of a son with the barren Sarah; after fourteen more years, he set aside his son after the flesh; he believed what to man was impossible, and so having received his son, as himself dead, he offered him up in faith that God could make alive the dead. But it was a mightier faith which offered up his son, than that which left his father's house; it was a stronger faith which offered up the son in whom he had the promises, than that which believed that the son would be given him. And so S. James asks, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son?"

And this justification was the fulfilment of the other. "The Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God." Abraham was already justified before the faith, of which Moses and S. Paul say, "it was imputed to him for righteousness." For this was said of the promise of a son; but Abraham had already believed and obeyed before this promise, and God had already said to him, "I will bless thee,

[g] Gen. xiv. 22; xiii. 13.

and thou shalt be a blessing, and in thee shall the families of the earth be blessed." But with the increase of trials of faith, there was an increase of faith; and with the increase of faith, there was an increase of righteousness.

So then, S. Paul, when he says, "it was imputed to him for righteousness," as well as S. James, when he says, that those words were fulfilled in him, speaks not of Abraham's first being received to righteousness, but of the increase of righteousness. Both lay down general principles; S. Paul, that faith is ever, first and last, the root of our justification; S. James, that that faith justifieth not, which does not, when it is possible, issue in act. But since Abraham was already justified, then S. Paul, when he says that "faith was counted to him for righteousness," does not mean that it was accounted to him, as being what it was not. It was accounted to him, not on account of any previous desert, but in itself. God, of His own free grace, so counted it to him; yet as the faith was inward, so was the righteousness which accrued to him. The righteousness of which S. Paul too speaks, is an accession of righteousness upon an accession of faith; as in the Gospels it is said of our Lord's disciples, "His disciples believed on Him," i. e., they received a further degree of belief to which their former belief was, as it were, no belief. To the mere character of "being pardoned" there is no accession, there are no degrees. But S. Paul, as well as S. James,

speaks of a righteousness, of which there are degrees, a store which is being continually enlarged, as God accounts for righteousness the gift and grace of faith, which He first imparts and afterwards elicits and enlarges.

When on the other hand, S. James says, that "the Scripture was fulfilled," he, in fact, asserts the identity of that living faith of which S. Paul speaks, with the works of faith of which he himself is speaking. The Scripture "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness," received a renewed and enlarged fulfilment by his being justified through the offering of his son. Yet this could not have been, had there not been the same principle of both; faith, not issuing as yet in act, when, as in believing the promise of the son, there was no outward act to perform; and faith issuing in act, so soon as God called it to act, as in the sacrifice of that son. Nor could it again have been a fulfilment, unless the result had been the same, and S. Paul's words "counted unto him for righteousness," had been the same as James's "were justified." His faith was the channel to him of real righteousness, and since Abraham was already justified, he through that living faith, a faith, when it could, "working by love," received an accession to that righteousness[h].

[h] S. Paul, when he excludes works from justification, plainly excludes all works, *done before grace*, whether ceremonial or moral. He himself explains, that under "the deeds of the law," he includes the

iii. And so also as to the relation of good works to eternal life. Those on the one side, may be mainly anxious to shew that our good works have *of themselves* no proper claim to eternal life, and so they wish to set forth the free mercy and goodness of God in Christ, Who "crowneth in mercy and loving-kindness," all those whose "sins He has forgiven and healed all their infirmities." Those on the other side, may chiefly intend to secure the literal meaning of Holy Scripture, when it speaks of reward, that "God will render unto every man *according to* his works[i];"

moral law. For, as the very ground of his words, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight," he subjoins, "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." (Rom. iii. 20.) But he himself explains this of the decalogue, "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" (Ibid., vii. 7.) S. James, on the other hand, plainly means, works which follow immediately upon justification, as appears from his instancing Rahab. Yet he speaks also of works as having the same relation to Rahab's faith, who was just converted, as to Abraham's in the crowning act of the living operative faith of half a century. S. Paul says that a man is justified by faith without works, preceding faith, yet by a faith which worketh by love. S. James denies that a man is justified by a faith which worketh not. The statements of the two Apostles are correlative. S. James's words do not exclude the need of God's mercy, as appears from his words, just before, "He shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment" (ii. 13); and S. Paul teaches explicitly the same as S. James when he says, "The doers of the law shall be justified," i.e. they who by the grace of God obey Him, as our Lord says, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." And again, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." This harmony of S. Paul and S. James is given by S. Augustine with his usual clearness. See note at the end.

[i] S. Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. ii. 23; xx. 12; xxii. 12.

"great is your *reward* in heaven[j];" "they shall walk in white, for they are *worthy*[k];" "henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the *Righteous Judge*, shall give me in that day[l]." For, however eternal life is the gift of God in Christ Jesus, and for His merits' sake, He does not give it *only* as His free gift, but to those "who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality." Those on the one side, deny that God will, of His own mere goodness, admit to eternal bliss one who, being capable of working, yet as the slothful servant, worketh not; the other denies that the works of the regenerate, although pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, can, of themselves, put away sins and endure the severity of God's judgments.

Yet as to the value of such works, Davenant freely admits that they "have in them a goodness truly supernatural[m]"—"in that they are done, not only with the general help of God, but by the special motion and impulse of the Holy Ghost, Who dwelleth in the hearts of the regenerate[n]," and *that*, "through the medium of qualities of infused grace, which exceed the order of nature. For the Spirit of God not only, (he says,) arouses the faithful by a secret motion to well-doing, but infuses and im-

[j] S. Matt. v. 12; x. 41, 42; S. Luke vi. 35; 1 Cor. iii. 8, 14; Col. iii. 24; Heb. xi. 26; 2 John 8.

[k] Rev. iii. 4.

[l] 2 Tim. iv. 8.

[m] De just. habit. et actual. c. 32. Thes. 1.

[n] Ibid., Membr. i. § 1.

presses on them habitual and permanent gifts, such as are faith, hope, charity, continence, patience, through which they work more gladly, readily, and firmly, things good and pleasing to God[o]." "The good works then of the regenerate, since they flow from this supernatural grace, must needs have in them a goodness truly supernatural." "These works which we call good are produced," he says, "not only by a supernatural Inworker [Almighty God], through the medium of a supernatural quality [inherent grace], but they are referred to an end altogether supernatural, the Glory of God[p]."

"These works of the justified," he adds, "please God with a supernatural, fatherly, saving complacency;" "because the person [of the justified] is first pleasing in the Mediator and reconciled to God[q];" "then, the works of the regenerate flow from a heart purified by faith, inflamed with charity, in a word, reformed after the image of God by grace." "Being, then, the effects of supernatural grace, they obtain this, that they are in a supernatural order, well-pleasing to God." "The last cause of this gratuitous acceptance," he adds, "may be that the regenerate, according to their strength and measure of grace received, endeavour to serve God, and if it befal them, that through the sluggishness of the flesh they sometimes slacken, they arouse themselves diligently, and seek most humbly pardon of their infirmity." "These works," he says

[o] Ibid., § 2. [p] Ibid., § 3. [q] Ibid., Membr. 2.

further, "have an ordained relation[r] to the Divine rewards, on account of the promise of God preceding, on account of the condition or state of the person working, and for the very quality of the works themselves." For having first laid down that "the inheritance of eternal life is first granted gratis to all the justified and regenerated, when they are engrafted into Christ and adopted to be children of God;" he contends also that "good works have a certain ordained relation, or at least aptitude to be ordained towards the Divine rewards from the very condition of him who worketh them." For he "being admitted into the grace and friendship of God," "the law of friendship requires, that whatever services a humble friend performeth to his great Friend, be weighed, not according to the slightness of the office performed, but according to the munificence and dignity of Him to Whom they are offered." And for the works themselves, he paraphrases our Lord's words on the cup of cold water, "as though He said, there is no work so slight, but that if it be done for My love and My honour, it gains a rich reward to him who doth it."

On the other hand, the whole Western Church prays together to God in Sexagesima, "O God, Who seest that we put not our trust in anything that we do[s];" all alike pray as now, that "God

[r] Ordinationem.

[s] Deus, qui conspicis, quia ex nulla nostra actione confidimus, &c., quoted by Bellarm., de Justif. v. 7, who quotes also from a Collect for

would absolve His people from their offences[t];" all pray, that "plenteously bringing forth good works, they may be of God plenteously rewarded." All, in approaching to the Holy Mysteries of His Body and Blood, say to God, in the words of the prophet Daniel, "we do not presume to come before Thee, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies[u]." All say in common, "not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences[x]." And since we claim not for ourselves or our past deserts, His presence in His Sacraments, how much less the fulness of His unveiled love! If

the second Sunday in Advent, "Ubi nulla suppetunt suffragia meritorum, tuis nobis succurre præsidiis." The Collect was also in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries, and there somewhat stronger, tuæ nobis indulgentiæ succurre præsidiis. S. Greg. Sacram. p. 187. ed. Ben. The whole Collect is, "Be propitious, O Lord, we beseech Thee, to the prayers and sacrifices of our lowliness; and since we have no merits to plead, do Thou succour us by the protection of Thy mercy."

[t] See Palmer's Antiquities of English Ritual, i. 355, 6.

[u] Mr. Palmer quotes (ii. 131) from the Liturgy of S. Basil the following words: "Wherefore, most holy Lord, we too, sinners, and Thine unworthy servants, to whom it has been vouchsafed to minister at Thy holy Altar, not for our righteousnesses (for we have done no good upon the earth) but for Thy mercies and Thy compassions, which Thou hast poured out abundantly upon us, approach to Thy holy Altar." In the Præparatio ad Missam, in the Roman Missal, a prayer begins, "To the Table of Thy most sweet Feast, O loving Lord Jesus Christ, I, a sinner, nothing presuming on my own merits, but trusting in Thy mercy and goodness, fear and tremble to approach."

[x] In the Roman Missal the prayer is, "To us also sinners, Thy servants, who hope in the multitude of Thy mercies, vouchsafe to give some part and society with Thy holy Apostles and Martyrs, with John, &c., and all Thy saints, into whose fellowship admit us, not as a weigher of merits but a bestower of pardon, through Christ our Lord. (non æstimator meriti, sed veniæ, quæsumus, largitor admitte." Also quoted by Bellarm. l. c.).

in the holiest season, when we plead the memorial of His Passion, and are the most gathered up in Him, most united to Him, we pray Him not to "weigh our merits but pardon our offences," how much more in the residue of our lives!

All would individually long to say with S. Ambrose, "I fear not to die, because I have a good Lord." "Knowing," S. Augustine says, "the judgment of Divine equity, he said he trusted rather in the good Lord, to Whom also he said daily in the Lord's Prayer, 'Forgive us our trespasses[y].'" All would desire with S. Augustine to pass the close of their life with the Penitential Psalms[z], and in David's prayer, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O Lord, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified."

All would say with S. Bernard[a], "whether I will

[y] Possid. Vita S. Aug. c. 27.

[z] Ib., c. 31. "That holy man, in his long life given to him by God for the benefit and happiness of the Holy Catholic Church, lived 76 years; as a Clerk or Bishop, nearly 40. But he was wont to say to us in his familiar converse, that from Baptism, even esteemed Christians and Bishops ought not to depart out of the body, without a worthy and competent course of penitence. And this he himself too did in that last illness in which he departed. For he had those few Psalms of David on penitence written out, and while lying on his bed, he used, in the days of his sickness, to look at the squares, placed against the wall, and read, and wept largely and continually; and lest this his purpose should be hindered by any one, about ten days before he departed out of the body, he requested of us who were present, that no one should come in to him, except at those times only, when the physicians were to look at him, or when refreshment was brought him. This was observed and done, and all that time he gave himself wholly to prayer."

[a] De off. Episc., c. 6, fin.

or no, I must stand before Him, to give account of the things done in the body to Him, Whom no word escapes, no thought evades. Before Him Who weighs deserts so justly, beholds so narrowly the secrets of the heart, who would boast that he had a clean heart? She alone will find grace in His eyes which boasteth not, presumeth not, contendeth not—humility. 'For God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble.' Whoso is truly humble, contendeth not in judgment, nor holdeth forth righteousness, but saith, 'Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O Lord.' He declineth justice and asketh for mercy, trusting that he can more readily obtain pardon, than claim justice."

All would say with S. Augustine[b], "I fear when Thou inspectest, Thou wilt find more sins than deserts. This alone I ask; this I say; this I long to obtain, 'Despise not Thou the works of Thine own hands.' Look at Thy work in me, not at mine. For mine if Thou seest, Thou condemnest; Thine, if Thou seest, Thou crownest. For whatsoever good works I may even have, I have from Thee, and therefore they are Thine, more than mine. For I hear from Thy Apostle, 'By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works.' So then whether as we are men, or as from our ungodliness

[b] In Ps. cxxxvii. fin.

we have been changed and justified, O Lord, despise not Thou the works of Thine own hands." All would long to say with him, if by God's grace they do indeed overcome; "We who were conquered in ourselves, in Him have we conquered. He then crowneth thee, Who crowneth His own gifts, not thy merits. Whence hast thou fought the good fight, whence hast thou kept the faith? Not I, but the grace of God which was with me. So then in this, too, that thou art crowned, thou art crowned by His mercy. Never be proud; ever praise the Lord; forget not all His benefits. His benefit is it, when, a sinner and ungodly, thou wert called, that thou mightest be justified. His benefit, that thou wert held upright and guided that thou shouldest not fall. His benefit, that strength was supplied thee, to persevere unto the end. His benefit, that that flesh too, wherewith thou wert weighed down, should rise again and not a hair of thy head perish. His benefit, that after thy resurrection thou shouldest be crowned. His benefit, that without failing thou shouldest praise God Himself for ever. O forget not all His benefits if thou wouldest that thy soul should bless the Lord Who crowneth thee in mercy and loving kindness[c]." "The Lord shall rejoice in His works, not in thine *as though thine;* for thy works too, if evil, are so through thine iniquity; if good, through the grace of God[d]."

It is easy to select hard and technical sayings on

[c] In Ps. cii. § 7. [d] Id. in Ps. ciii. Serm. iv. § 15.

the one side and on the other; it is easy to find sayings which deny the value of works wrought through the grace of Christ, or which exaggerate them. It is easy to misunderstand, hard to understand unless we love. For unless we love, we do not wish to understand. It is easy to distort, hard to see aright, unless we wish to see one another, and one another's meaning, in the light and truth and love of God.

All believe that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, Himself the Way, to Himself the Life. All believe that to do, by His grace, the works which He giveth and willeth us to do, is the way by which we hold on in that Way. He Alone is "the cause of our reigning[e];" "deeds" done by His grace, are the "way to" His eternal "kingdom;" yet we should not have been in the way, had not He freely placed us in it; we should fail by the way, unless He through His grace strengthened us; we should perish from the way, unless He by His grace retained us; we should be let in the race set before us, so as never to attain, unless He freed us from the burden of our sins. "He who willeth and runneth must glory not in himself, but in Him

[e] "If from God is the will, from God also is the desert. Yet from God questionless is to will and to do for His good pleasure. God then is the Author of merit, Who both applies our will to the work, and unfolds the work to our will. Else if we would speak rightly of what we call our merits, they are a sort of seed-plot of hope, incentives of love, tokens of the hidden predestination, presages of future bliss, the way to the kingdom, not the cause of reigning. For whom He justified, not whom He found just, them He glorified." S. Bern. de lib. arb. fin.

from Whom he had both to will and to run." Let us adore and thank Him Who is the Way; let us hold on in the way; and we shall see that we have the same hope, trust, stay, our one Lord and God, Who is above all to protect, and through all, by His power and working, and in all by His grace and love.

All is of Christ. His is the grace, which brought us out of the mass of our natural corruption in Adam. His was the new principle of life, which in baptism he imparted to us. His the grace which cherished, nurtured, enlarged, that first gift, or if unhappily we wasted it, through repentance, brought us back, converted, renewed, restored us. His, each gift of superadded grace, whereby He rewards the use which, through His grace, we make of each former grace, bestowing grace for grace. And life eternal, too, will be from Him, grace for grace. For, as S. Augustine says, "If our good life is nothing else than the grace of God, without doubt eternal life, which is given to a good life, is the grace of God; for it too is given gratis, because that to which it is given, is given gratis. But that to which it is given, is merely grace; but this which is given to it, since it is its reward, is grace for grace, as a reward for righteousness, that that may be true, (since it is true,) that God shall render to every man according to his works [f]."

[f] De Grat. et lib. arb., c. viii. § 20. t. x. p. 728.

But although faith and works are one whole, yea, "the one work in which all works are, is 'faith, which worketh by love,' as the Lord Himself says, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe in Him whom He hath sent[g],'" God assigns to us works as the test of our faith, not faith as the test of our works. And this, because it is easy to deceive ourselves as to our faith or our feelings; it is not so easy to deceive ourselves as to our deeds, if we will but look into our consciences by the light of the law of God. It is easy to say, "Lord, Lord;" it is *not* easy, but of the power of the grace of God, to "deny ourselves and take up our cross and follow Him." It is a toilless task to "hear His words and do them not, building a house upon the sand." It is *not* easy to be poor in spirit, and meek, and pure in heart, and to pray without ceasing, and in every thing to give thanks; to resist "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life," and "keep thyself unspotted from the world." It is easy, while going along the broad way, to call up to one's-self, out of some forgotten corner of the heart, a vague belief of the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. It is *not* easy, amid the fire of passion within, the manifold force of temptation without, the delusive pleasures dancing before our eyes, the treachery of our own hearts, to be "dead to the world, that we may live to God." It is an easy, costless, confession, to own ourselves what we are,

[g] S. Aug. in Ps. lxxxix. fin.

"unprofitable servants;" it is hard, first to labour with our whole strength, through the grace of God, to "do all things whatsoever He hath commanded," and then, and then only, it will be the fruit of God's grace to own it.

But hard though it be, our Lord, if ye indeed seek Him, will, by His grace, make it easy. For He saith, "My yoke is easy." Meditate but a little daily, on the truths of faith. Faith will open to your sight heaven and your eternal home. Faith will shew to you your Lord at the right hand of God interceding for you, looking down with pity upon you, for you pleading those five glorious wounds, which, radiant with the glory of His Godhead, fill heaven with adoring amazement at the boundlessness of His love for each one of us. Faith will shew you the vacant throne, amid the choirs of angels, vacant for each of you, if you pray for the grace of Christ to persevere unto the end. Faith will shew you the serene peace, the mutual charity, the adoring love, the blissful contemplation, the transporting gladness, the pure harmony, the Divine beauty, the thrilling joy of unutterable thankfulness, the unsating fulness of bliss, the indissoluble union with thy Redeemer and thy God, where the pleasures at His Right Hand are for evermore.

Then embody thy faith in acts. Faith without acts of faith is but a dream. If thou believest that thy Judge in the Great Day, will reward deeds of mercy, and punish the unmerciful, deny thyself

that thou mayest shew mercy to Him in His poor. If thou believest that "the pure in heart shall see God," pray Him Who searcheth the heart, to cleanse thine, and admit not into it any thought which leads to sin. If thou believest that "the world passeth away," set not thy hopes, thy love, thy ambition, on this passing world, to pass away with the world on which thou buildest. If thou believest in eternity, live for eternity. Sow sparingly, if, so sowing, thou hopest to reap bountifully. Sow to the flesh, if, so sowing, thou hopest to reap incorruption. "Walk in the ways of thy heart, and in the sight of thine eyes," if "for these things God will" *not* "bring thee into judgment[h]." But if thou believe that "God worketh in us to will and to do of His good pleasure," that He is the Author, He the Finisher, He the exceeding great Reward of thy faith, then, what thou doest, do, not for the praise of men, not for thine own exaltation, not for any worldly end, but for God. If God is thine end, then see how thou mayest with a strong hand, by the grace of God, cast forth out of thyself what may displease God; how thou mayest perfect in thyself, by His grace, any grace which God hath given thee; how thou mayest by strong importunity, besiege the love of God, and obtain from Him any grace thou lackest.

So shalt thou find, not in words but in life, that faith and deeds of faith are one, given in one by

[h] Eccles. xi. 9.

God to thee, and from thee in one to go back to God. As thou by faith beholdest the greatness of God and of His eternal grace, His ineffable holiness, majesty, glory, goodness, love, thou wilt know and feel the nothingness of all in thyself, whether faith or works, save as they are the gift of God. As thou probest thyself, thou wilt see the more thine own evil. But as thou ownest thine own evil and God's good, He will take away from thee thine evil, and crown in thee His own good; as thou ownest thyself in thyself an unprofitable servant, He, owning in thee His own work, will say unto thee, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Amen.

Thanks be to God.

S. AUGUSTINE'S HARMONY OF S. PAUL AND S. JAMES, ON FAITH AND WORKS.

SEEING that the Apostle Paul, preaching that "a man is justified by faith without works," was not rightly understood by those, who so understood the saying as to think, that when once they had believed in Christ, they could be saved by faith, although they did evil deeds and lived wickedly: this passage of his Epistle (S. James ii. 20.) explains that same meaning of the Apostle Paul, how it is to be understood. Therefore he the rather uses the example of Abraham, that faith without good works is void; because the Apostle Paul also used the example of Abraham, to prove that "man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." For when he commemorates the good works of Abraham which accompanied his faith, he plainly shews that the Apostle Paul did not in such wise teach, through the example of Abraham, that a man is justified by faith without works, as that any should believe that it pertaineth not unto him to do good works; but this rather, that no man should think that, by the merits of works gone before, he had attained to the gift of justification which is by faith. For herein the Jews sought to set themselves above the Gentiles who believed in Christ, that they said that they had attained to the grace of the Gospel by the merits of good works under the law: and thus many who, from among them, had believed, were scandalized, that the grace of Christ should be given to the uncircumcised Gentiles. Wherefore the Apostle Paul saith, that a man may be justified by faith, without works, but those, [works] preceding [faith.] For when he is justified by faith, how can he but thenceforth work righteously, although beforehand having wrought nothing righteously, he attained to the justification of faith, not by the merit of good

works, but by the grace of God, which cannot now be void in him, since now he "worketh" righteously "by love." But if when any have believed, he forthwith depart out of this life, the justification of faith abideth with him; good works neither preceding (because he attained thereto not by merit, but by grace,) nor following, because he is not permitted to remain in this life. Hence it is manifest that what the Apostle Paul saith; "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without works," is not so to be understood as that, if any should live after having received faith, we may call him righteous, though he should live evilly. Therefore both the Apostle Paul uses the example of Abraham, because he was justified by faith without the deeds of the law which he had not received; and the Apostle James also, because he proves that good works followed the faith of Abraham himself, shewing how what the Apostle Paul preached is to be understood.

2. For they who think that this saying of the Apostle James is contrary to that of the Apostle Paul, may also conclude that even S. Paul himself contradicts himself, because he says in another place; "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." (Rom. ii. 13.) And in another: "But faith which worketh by love." (Gal. v. 6.) And again: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live." (Rom. viii. 13.) What those deeds of the flesh are, which are to be mortified through the deeds of the Spirit, he points out elsewhere, saying: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have also foretold you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. v. 19—21.) And to the Corinthians he saith: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but

ye were justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi. 9—11.) By which sayings he most plainly teacheth, that they had not attained to the justification of faith by any good works going before; nor had that grace been given to their deserts, when he saith: "And such were some of you." But when he saith: "They who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God," he plainly sheweth, that so soon as they believed, they ought to do good works. Which also S. James saith; and in many places altogether the same Apostle Paul preacheth clearly enough, that all who have believed in Christ must live righteously, lest they come to punishment. And our Lord Himself maketh mention of the same thing, saying: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven." (Matt. vii. 21.) And elsewhere: "Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke vi. 46.) And: "Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock, &c. And every one that heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand," &c. (S. Matt. vi. 24—7.) Wherefore the sayings of the two Apostles, S. Paul and S. James, are not contrary the one to the other, when the one saith that "a man is justified by faith without works," and the other, that "faith without works is dead;" because S. Paul is speaking of works which go before faith, S. James of works which followed after faith: as also S. Paul himself sheweth in many places.—S. Aug. Quæstt. 83. q. 76. t. vi. p. 67, 8. ed. Ben.

THE RULE OF FAITH

AS MAINTAINED BY THE FATHERS, AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A SERMON

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY

ON THE FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY 1851.

WITH A PREFACE

ON PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

FROM

BOSSUET.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW; CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

THIRD THOUSAND.

SOLD BY JAMES PARKER AND CO., OXFORD,
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;
AND RIVINGTONS,
LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.
1878.

PRINTED BY THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY OF THE HOLY TRINITY,
HOLY ROOD, OXFORD. 1878.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

THIS Sermon on "the Rule of faith" has remained long out of print; in the first instance, because of some trouble in verifying the quotations[1] from Liguori's "Glories of Mary," which some Roman Catholic controversialist had impugned. I have since twice verified them (having lost the first verifications) by the conscientious Redemptorist edition, published with the imprimatur of two successive Archbishops and Cardinals, Archbishops Wiseman and Manning.

Subsequently, as long as there was any hope that communion might be restored, yet we ourselves remain under our own Bishops (which the martyred Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Darboy, said to me, he thought might well be) and so that we should not, in case of restored communion, be flooded with these or similar devotions to the Blessed Virgin, there seemed to be no longer any occasion to dwell upon these devotions, which have always been our special crux, further than I had, in my first Eirenicon, shewn that they *were* our special crux, and how keenly we felt these innovations of the later Roman system.

The whole Roman system was changed by the Vatican Council. Until its close, the rule of faith at least was the same. The Roman Church too acknowledged with the Fathers, that the sole source of Faith was God's revelation of Himself in Holy Scripture; the interpreter of Holy

[1] See below, pp. 52—58. The quotations were every one accurate. I had lost the Dublin edition from which I had transcribed them, but the difference of translation in no case affected the sense. In the present edition I have substituted the Redemptorist translation, except that in some cases, where the original is given in Latin in the notes, I have translated the Latin when it seemed to me more energetic.

Scripture was the same, the universal Church from the first, according to the saying, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." The same body of truth, which was attested by Holy Scripture, was taught by the Apostles every where, before a word of Holy Scripture was written. Believed every where, it was transmitted every where. The unlettered martyrs knew it better, because more simply, than some of the learned, whose writings may have been preserved to us. There have been doubts about the faith of single writers, counted in the general title of "the fathers," and valid as testimonies, except in what was peculiar to each,—Origen, Tertullian and others. Origen's writings infected even S. Gregory of Nyssa. The faith of the Church remained the same. This was brought out by General Councils, in which Bishops, lettered or unlettered, were assembled from all parts of the world. All attested, 'So have we received;' and the concurrent testimony of all, and of every individual, was accepted as evident proof of a common original. Heresy enlarged the explanations of the Church: it did not develope its doctrine, which was the same before, as afterwards.

The Bishops of Rome (as they were then called) as the only Apostolic See of the West, had, of course, a great share in this; but it was only a share. There is evidence of their gathering the judgements of Western Bishops[2], in which case they represented the whole West. At the Council of Nice, the Bishop of Rome certainly did not preside; at the first Council of Constantinople, one only Western Bishop was present, and he in no relation to Rome. The enlarged Creed of Constantinople (our Nicene Creed) was framed for the needs of the Eastern Church, and continued to be their Creed alone for 70 years, until it was received by the whole Church at the Council of Chalcedon[3].

In the third general Council of Ephesus[4], the Epistle of

[2] See e. g. Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon iii. p. 260, Ep. Agathon. Conc. Gen. vi. Act. iv.

[3] See Dr. Pusey's "On the clause 'And the Son.'" pp. 35—45.

[4] See at length Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon iii. pp. 249—257.

S. Cyril to Nestorius, in which Pope Celestine had wholly concurred, was submitted to the Council, and each Bishop pronounced his own individual judgement upon it, without deference either to S. Cyril or S. Celestine; the Epistle of Nestorius, upon which S. Celestine had condemned him, was considered and condemned by an independent judgement, and Nestorius himself. In a letter to that Council, S. Celestine speaks of the whole Council as inspired by God the Holy Ghost in a way which he does not claim singly for himself.

At the Council of Chalcedon[5] the tome of S. Leo was read; expressions were doubted about by some Bishops of Illyria and Palestine, but were accepted, on the ground of like expressions of S. Cyril of Alexandria: finally the whole was accepted, not because it emanated from the Bishop of Rome, but because it agreed with the General Councils which had preceded it. The Roman legates themselves describe the Council of Ephesus by the words "the exposition of which Creed, set forth at Ephesus by Cyril of blessed memory." The Bishops in a long succession, one by one, expressed their concurrence with it on the ground of that agreement. S. Leo spoke of the strength which the faith, which he had himself put forth, had gained through the concurrence of the 600 Bishops of the Council.

The fifth General Council had the account of the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus in regard to the Epistles of S. Cyril, Nestorius, and Celestine, recited to them, and the approval of S. Leo's Epistle to Flavian in the Council of Chalcedon and adopted their proceedings as a guide to their own. But the special subject of their praise was that the Council did not accept the writings without examination:

"[6] From the aforesaid it has become manifest how the holy synods have been wont to approve what is brought before them. For although those most holy men who wrote the epistles recited [S. Celestine, S. Cyril, S. Leo] were so dis-

[5] See Ib. pp. 259—260.

[6] Conc. Gen. v. Collat. vi. Conc. vi. 169 Col.

tinguished [splenduerunt], yet the Synod did not approve those Epistles simply and without examination, unless they had ascertained that they were in all things consonant with the exposition and doctrine of the holy fathers, with which also they were compared, whence all who were in the synod uttered one harmonious word."

"Following then this rule," they had the decree of Chalcedon read, as the test whether the writings of Ibas, Theodorus, and those alleged of Theodoret, agreed with it.

The independent examination of the writings of even eminent Popes by General Councils, in order to ascertain their agreement with the faith laid down by previous Councils, which had taken place in the third or fourth General Councils, was laid down as a principle in the fifth.

S. Gregory the Great in an Encyclical letter to all the Patriarchs, professes, "[7] I receive and venerate the four Councils as I do the four holy Gospels. The fifth Council I venerate in like way. All the persons whom the venerable Councils aforesaid reject, I reject; those whom they reverence, I receive; because, seeing *they are established by universal consent,* whoever presumes either to loose whom they bind or to bind whom they loose, destroys himself, not them."

This is not the language of one who might himself have written the decrees of those Councils, and whose single voice would have saved all the toil and sacrifice of life involved in the gathering of aged Bishops from all quarters of the world. Had Papal infallibility been then believed, Sylvester or S. Damasus or S. Celestine or S. Leo might by themselves have set to rest the heresies of Arius or Macedonius or Nestorius or Eutyches.

Pope Vigilius in his second "Constitutum" recognises that the Council of Chalcedon only accepted the Epistle of S. Leo after ascertaining that it agreed with the three general Councils before it, and says that it *required* this.

[7] Epp. L. i. Ep. 25, Opp. ii. 515.

He recites from the Acts the allegations of the Bishops, that S. Leo's Epistle agreed with the preceding Councils, and that they therefore received it; then says, "[8] These things being so, no one doubts that our fathers did believe that the Epistle of the Blessed Leo was on that ground received by them, that it agreed with the doctrines of the Synods of Nice and Constantinople, as also with those of the Blessed Cyril set forth in the first Council of Ephesus." He then argues, "If then that Epistle of so great a Pontiff, refulgent with such light of orthodox faith, *requires (exigit)* to be approved by such comparison; how could that Epistle to Maris be supposed to be called orthodox by the same fathers, &c.

In the sixth General Council the dogmatic letters of Pope Agatho, and of the Roman Council held by him, were proposed for acceptance. The Patriarch and the Bishops asked for copies of both, in order to compare them, and the authorities alleged in them, with the MSS. in the Patriarchal Library[9]. This being granted, in the next Session, three weeks afterwards, the same question was asked. The Patriarch answered, "[1] Having inspected the whole bearing of the relations sent by Agatho, the most holy Pope of the elder Rome, and from his Synod, and having diligently searched the books of the holy and approved fathers, laid up in my Patriarchate, I found all the testimonies of the holy and approved fathers contained in those relations agreeing and in nothing differing therefrom, and I agree therewith, and so I confess and believe." Another Bishop said, "Having heard the relations sent by Agatho the most holy Pope of Rome to our good lord, I have found that they in no way contradict the holy fathers and I confess two wills, &c." Another says that he "had read them, taken knowledge of the testimonies lying in them, and so held; for so he had believed before, when they were read, and still believed."

[8] Constitutum pro damnat. 3 Capitul. A. C. 554, n. 15, Conc. vi. 297 Col.
[9] Conc. vi. Act. vii. Conc. vii. 752 Col. [1] Ib. Act. viii. Conc. vii. 57 Col.

The Synodical Epistle, which is entitled in the Latin copies, "[2] the epistle of Agatho and the 152 Bishops of the Roman Synod, which was as an instruction of the legates who were sent to celebrate the sixth Synod," itself runs in a remarkable form, as the common expression of all. So Agatho himself subscribed it, "[3] together with the common of the whole synod of the Apostolic throne which was held in behalf of the truth of the Apostolic confession." The Bishops, one by one, subscribed it as "the relation, which *we* have composed with one mind in behalf of our Apostolic faith."

After the Council had received the Epistle of S. Agatho, they put the heretical Patriarch, Macarius, on his trial, on the ground of his non-acceptance of it, but resting its authority upon their own reception of it. "[4] Since the most venerable Macarius does not agree with the tenor of the orthodox relations sent by Agatho the most holy Pope of Rome, which have been already read before your Holinesses, *whereunto also we have all gladly agreed*, &c."

In the seventh General Council, the consent of the Council to the letters of Pope Adrian was asked by the Apostolic legates. They were accepted by Tarasius Bishop of Constantinople, "[5] examining the Scriptures and taught by the doctrine of the Fathers." "We agree," Tarasius says, "and confirm the force of the Epistles read."

S. Chrysostom, unlawfully deposed in a Synod by Theophilus of Alexandria, appealed to Innocent. Innocent wished a general Council to be assembled. "[6] The purpose of the Roman Church," writes S. Chrysostom's biographer, "is not to communicate with the Eastern Bishops, especially Theophilus, until God give a place for a General Synod, which should heal the diseased members of those who did this." Arcadius refused the Synod; S. Chrysostom's name

[2] Con. vi. Act. iv. col. 703 Col. [3] Ib. col. 717. [4] Ib. Act. viii. col. 768.
[5] Conc. vii. Act. ii. [6] Pallad. Vit. S. Chrys. Opp. xiii. 84, 85.

was restored to the diptych by the united sentence of the whole West.

Pope Simplicius, who is said to have used great prudence in writing to the Emperor Zeno in difficult times, joins the authority of the Church with his own. The Vatican decree says, "*not* from the consent of the Church." Pope Simplicius says, "with." He says[7], "What has deserved to be cut off with the edge of the Gospel pruning-hook by Apostolic hands, *with the assent of the universal Church*, cannot recover power of fresh growth." To Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he speaks of "Timothy the Cat" as "[8]threatening new conventions for himself, thinking that that can be loosed, which the authority of the whole has decreed concerning him." He says that "a Synod was never called, except when some new perversion arose, or some ambiguity in asserting doctrine, that, if there was any ambiguity, the authority of Episcopal deliberation might illumine it, when they treated of it together, as the impiety first of Arius, then of Nestorius, then of Dioscorus and Eutyches compelled to be done." The authority, which Simplicius thought it "abominable" to contravene in act, was not his own, but "the judgement of all the priests of the Lord in all the world."

S. Leo III. said to the legates of Charlemagne, "[9]Far be it from me, not only that I should prefer myself, but that I should set myself on a par with them" (the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon), when he was asked to admit the Filioque into the Creed.

Innocent III, when asked by Philip Augustus to dissolve his marriage, rightly answers that he could not, on account of our Lord's words, and the absence of any examples or decrees of the Saints or the fathers. But he

[7] Ep. iv. ad Zenon. Conc. v. 98 Col. [8] Ep. v. ad Acac. Ib. 99.

[9] Rescr. Leon. III. ad Carol. M., in Conc. Aquisgr. A. 809, Conc. ix. p. 279 Col. See at length Bossuet l. c. ix. 27; translated in Eirenicon iii. pp. 237—239.

adds, "[1] If we should attempt to determine any thing hereon, without the determination of a General Council, besides offending God, and worldly infamy which we might incur therefrom, perhaps peril might impend over our order and office."

John XXII., in his memorable profession on his death-bed[2], "submitted" everything that he had written or spoken in any way whatsoever to the "decision" of the Church and of his successors. S. Gregory XI., also near his death[3], emphatically recalled "whatever he had said erroneous, against the Catholic Faith, what he had said in Consistory and in Council as in conversation; and he recognised in himself everything, whereby any mortal man could err, knowingly or ignorantly, in private or in public."

Still stronger are the words of Pius IV. when consulting his Cardinals, whether he could "dissolve by" his "power a marriage through words in the present [i. e. 'I take thee,' &c.] which is a true marriage and a true sacrament according to the sounder minds of Theologians." "[4] Do not," he says, "waste time in collecting the precedents and facts of our predecessors, which we profess that we will follow, if they agree with the authority of Scripture and grounds of Theology. For I doubt not that I and my predecessors may have been mistaken, not in this fact only, but in others also."

A Papal Bull, "Deus novit," published in the name of Eugenius IV., says, "[5] The Pope has power above all Councils; *unless perchance, what was to be enacted related to the Catholic faith;* or unless, if omitted, it would notably disturb the condition of the universal Church, because then the *sentence of the Council would be to be attended to.*"

[1] Innoc. iii. Epp. iv. 106.

[2] Rainald Ann. T. xv. a. 1334, p. 17.

[3] Testam. Greg. xi. Spicil. vi. 676, Boss. quoted Ib. 239.

[4] Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mém. de Casteln. T. ii. pp. 427, 428. Ib. 240.

[5] Bull. Eugen. iv. Conc. xii. 537, Eiren. p. 183.

Bossuet adduces, as another class of evidence, how in the early Church questions, upon which the Bishop of Rome had pronounced in the strongest way, remained unsettled until a General Council. There can hardly be a more pronounced way of speaking ex cathedra on any matter of faith or practice than to excommunicate or renounce the Communion of those who held otherwise.

1. We know not on what ground the churches of Asia Minor kept Easter in a different way from other churches. S. Polycarp, when for some ground he was at Rome[6], conferred with Anicetus its Bishop on this and "some other things on which they had some slight differences with each other." He alleged the practice of S. John, and neither party persuaded the other[6], but Anicetus shewed great honour to S. Polycarp.

Victor however subsequently, against the remonstrances of S. Irenæus and contrary to the practice of his predecessors[7], rejected the Communion of the Asiatic Churches[8], because they kept Easter as S. Polycarp alleged that he had always done, "together with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles whose disciple he was." Victor attempted[9] to cut them off but failed, bringing on himself sharp remonstrances from other Bishops. "[1]These" [proclamations that "the Asiatic churches were out of communion"] "did not please at least all the Bishops. They contrariwise exhort him to mind what appertains to peace and union and love to our neighbours. Their words also are extant, in which they upbraid Victor sharply. Among these [and so one of them only] Irenæus also wrote in the name of the brethren in Gaul over whom he presided."

[6] ἐπιδημήσαντος τῇ Ρώμῃ S. Iren. Ep. ad Victor. ap. Eus. H. E. v. 24.

[7] S. Iren. ib. [8] Eus. l. c.

[9] Eusebius first says, "On this Victor, who was bishop of the Romans, attempts (πειρᾶται) to cut off all at once from the common unity the dioceses of all Asia with the neighbouring Churches." Then he subjoins at once, "and posts (στηλιτεύει) by letters, proclaiming at least (γε) that all the brethren here were wholly out of communion." The word "attempts" implies that he failed, as Stephen did in the case of S. Cyprian, since S. Cyprian remained in communion with all other churches, before the peace-loving Bishop, Sixtus, probably renewed communion.

[1] Eus. l. c.

Several local Councils[2] were held, from which it appears that the Asiatic mode of keeping Easter was exceptional. Whether communion was restored or no[3], the question itself remained unsettled till the General Council of Nice, which, without censure or any reference to previous authority, prescribed one uniform mode of keeping it. "[4]The Syrians, Cilicians and Mesopotamians were," at the time of the council of Nice, "out of order in celebrating the Feast and kept Easter with the Jews. This gave occasion for an Ecumenical Council, that the feast might be everywhere celebrated on one day, &c. It took place then and the Syrians submitted. They [the Council] wrote concerning the Easter, 'It seemed good as follows,' for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance." The Asiatic Churches, which had disregarded the judgement of the Bishop of Rome, submitted to the Council.

2. In the early Church there were conflicting opinions on the value of heretical Baptism. The East seems mostly to have denied or doubted its validity[5]: the West, to have believed that it was valid, if the Scriptural words were used, although the Minister who used them (if an Arian) disbelieved them. In Asia Minor the denial seems to have been extended to schismatical Baptism. S. Cyprian and a large Synod of African Bishops affirmed its invalidity: Stephen, Bishop of Rome, thereupon renounced his communion. S. Cyprian wrote to S. Firmilian, a very eminent Bishop in Asia Minor, whose answer is so strongly worded that a few Roman critics have questioned its genuineness. He speaks of S. Stephen as excommunicating himself when he excommunicated all besides.

[2] Eus. l. c. relates that Irenæus wrote the like, not only to Victor but to several other Bishops. He mentions letters of Synods of "Palestine, Rome under Victor; Pontus, the churches of Gaul, Osrhoene and the neighbouring cities, of Bacchyllus Bishop of Corinth and many others."

[3] Sozomen (vii. 19), by an anachronism apparently, ascribes to Victor what S. Irenæus relates of Anicetus. R. C. writers seem to assume the restoration of communion with Rome, because other Churches did not break communion with those of Asia. [4] S. Athan. Counc. Arim. and Seleuc. n. 7, p. 79 O.T.

[5] See the authorities in note G on Tertullian p. 281 sqq. O.T.

Even Saints, in an earnest matter, use "sharp contention," if equals; and so Pope S. Stephen called S. Cyprian a "false Christ," a "false Apostle," a "deceitful worker." S. Firmilian writes to S. Cyprian of Stephen in language which no one could imagine being used as to a matter of Ecclesiastical practice to Bishops of Rome now. "[6] I am justly indignant at such open and manifest folly in Stephen." "Is not Stephen ashamed to assert?" "How diligently has Stephen kept these salutary commands and warnings of the Apostle;" and as an apostrophe to himself, "How great sin hast thou heaped up, when thou didst cut thyself off. Deceive not thyself: for he is truly the schismatic who has thus made himself an apostate from the communion of the unity of the Church."

A successor of Pope Stephen[7] probably restored communion with S. Cyprian. There is no evidence that S. Cyprian retracted anything. S. Augustine praises him that he made no schism. Holding him to be in error, he says, "[8] We ourselves should not venture to assert anything of this sort" (viz. what Pope Stephen had asserted), "unless we were supported by the most concordant authority of the Universal Church; to which he himself [S. Cyprian] would doubtless yield, if at that time the truth of this question had already been solidly established, having been cleared and declared by a plenary Council."

A "plenary Council" then, not the Bishop of Rome, was, in S. Augustine's mind, the ultimate authority.

In like way S. Augustine blames the Donatists, not for appealing from the Synod of 18 Bishops assembled at Rome under Melchiades, but that they did not acquiesce in the judgement of the "plenary Council to which the cause was then referred." "[9] See, let us suppose that all the Bishops who judged at Rome, were not good judges, there still remained a plenary Council of the Universal Church,

[6] S. Firmilian ap. S. Cyprian. Ep. lxxv. v. fin.

[7] S. Sixtus, thence probably called by Pontius (life of S. Cyprian) a "peace-loving Bishop." [8] S. Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. ii. 3, Opp. ix. 98.

[9] S. Aug. Ep. xliii. ad Glor. Eleus., &c., c. 7. n. 19, Opp. ii. 97.

in which the cause might be canvassed with the judges themselves; so that if they should be proved to have judged amiss, their sentence might be annulled."

Afterwards also a wrong or rash decision of the Bishop of Rome was not acquiesced in. When Liberius renounced the communion of S. Athanasius, S. Athanasius only gently lamented his fall. When Cælestius appealed to Rome against the decision of African Bishops and presented to Zosimus an heretical confession of faith, Zosimus in error formally acquitted him. He spoke of his confession as a "good confession," a "clear and open statement;" of his examination as to "the complete faith of Cælestius;" and censured the African Bishops for not believing his former memorial; he wished the African Bishops to retract their judgement "for the better," said that his accusers would have to prove that Cælestius thought otherwise than he had put down in his memorial and confession. An African Council of 214 Bishops shewed him that Pelagius and Cælestius, whom he had acquitted, had been condemned by Innocent his predecessor: and spoke of his approving that memorial as Catholic being liable to be mischievous unless corrected[1].

We cannot tell now on what ground Hormisdas would not acknowledge the formula, about which the Scythian monks appealed to him, that "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh." S. Proclus had said before them, that "[2] one of the Trinity was incarnate." They guarded themselves against Eutychianism by the words "in the flesh:" they used their formula against Nestorianism. They may have been unduly urgent about their formula. But the question was, whether it was right or wrong. Hormisdas was appealed to by Justinian, "[3] Some say that Christ, crucified

[1] See more at length Eirenicon iii. pp. 219—226.

[2] "Unum ex Trinitate incarnatum." S. Procl. Ep. ad Arm. de fide. Bibl. P. ix. p. 615. The phrase, "Jesus Christ, One of the Holy Trinity," is used as a received phrase in the Sixth General Council. Constantine asks, "How do you hold as to the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is God the Word, One of the Holy Trinity?" Macarius answers, "I believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is One of the Holy Trinity." Act. viii. Conc. vii. 770, Col.

[3] Ep. ii. Justinian. ad Horm.

in the flesh for our salvation, ought to be spoken of as 'One of the Trinity.' We know not what to follow, what to avoid hereon: for the words seem to cause dissension: for the meaning is one among all Catholics." For himself, Justinian professes, "we believe that to be catholic, which shall be intimated to us by your religious answer."

Hormisdas, after detaining the monks at Rome for above a year, censured them very severely for turbulence, said nothing about the question, except as far as might be involved in his calling them "[4] despisers of ancient authorities," "eager after new questions," and declaring that "they were to be avoided, because they would have sown the accursed seed of the devil's tares, unless the steadfastness of the faithful people had resisted."

Peter the Deacon however, in the name of the rest "[5] who had been sent to Rome in a cause of faith," wrote to the Bishops who were in exile for the faith in Sardinia, and obtained from S. Fulgentius the answer which they had sought for in vain at Rome. His clear answer[6] removed all doubts. Justinian embodied the language in an edict[7] which he published A. 553 (12 years after the letter of Hormisdas, in which he rejected the monks) and wrote to Pope John II. to request him to write to himself, "[8] the most holy Bishop of this city and Patriarch, your brother, and make it clear that your holiness receives all those who rightly confess the above, and condemns the faithlessness of those who, Judaising, have ventured to deny the right faith." John II. held a Council at Rome, where, "[9] after diligent investigation of the question, after examining the judgement of Ferrandus and others beyond the seas, the (opposite) declaration of the Acœmetæ

[4] Ep. lxx. ad Posssess.

[5] Petri Diac. de Incarn., &c., ad Fulg. c. 1, and 4, Bibl. Patr. ix. 196, 197.

[6] S. Fulg. de Incarn. c. 10, Ib. p. 202.

[7] Cod. Just. L. vi. tit. de Sum. Trin.

[8] Ep. Justin. ad Joann. Conc.v. 888, 889 Col.

[9] Conc. Rom. sub Joan. ii. ib. 908 Col. See the whole history, as condensed by Bossuet Def., &c., ix. 16—18, translated Eirenicon iii. pp. 228—237.

(monks) was recited and refuted and Justinian's profession of faith was approved."

The lawfulness of an expression, touching the Holy Trinity, was settled, not by the Bishop of Rome to whom appeal was made, but, after he had cast a slur upon it, by the most eminent Theologian of the time, to whom appeal was made subsequently.

In later times also the unanimous judgement of the Church was thought necessary to establish a matter of faith. When the heresy of Adoptianism broke out in Spain, Charlemagne enquired by letter[1], "What thought the Apostolic Lord with the holy Roman Church and the Bishops dwelling in those parts; 2) What the Bishop of Milan thought and the doctors and priests of the Churches of Christ in Italy; 3) what those of Germany, Gaul and Aquitaine." Adrian anathematised Elipand and his followers. Yet this was not enough. Charlemagne, in harmony with Adrian who sent two legates, assembled the great Council of Frankfort. This condemned the patent heresy. From it Charlemagne wrote to Elipand and his fellow-bishops in Spain, professing for himself that he "held the Catholic faith, delivered by Apostolic teachers, and preserved by the whole Church:" he says, that he "had gathered a Council from all the Churches of his realm, in order that the holy unanimity of all might decree firmly what was to be believed as to the adoption of the flesh of Christ; "that he had written to the pontiff of the Apostolic see, wishing to know what the holy Roman Church, taught by Apostolic traditions, would answer;" that he had "called some from Britain." Of all alike he urged the "[2] pious *unanimity* and peaceful investigation:" "the faith strengthened by the testimony of many," "the authority of the Apostolic see *and the Episcopal unanimity.*"

Charlemagne, though a layman, is a competent witness of what was thought necessary to the force of a decree on matters of faith—the unanimous consent of the Church.

[1] Ep. Caroli M. ad Elip., &c., iv. Conc. Frankf. Conc. ix. 91 Col. [2] Ib. 93.

This is plainly the direct contradictory of the Vatican decree, that the Pope is infallible "not by consent of the Church." Yet Popes sought this confirmation.

"[2] The judgement of a general Council never was reconsidered but was obeyed. It was a saying of S. Gelasius an excellent Pontiff, '[3] A good and Christian synod, once passed, cannot and ought not to be discredited by any reiteration of a new Synod.' The judgement of the Holy Spirit is discredited, whenever it is reconsidered by a new judgement. But a judgement propounded by a Roman Pontiff is of such sort that it was reconsidered by a new judgement. It was not then that last and ultimate judgement of the Church."

Even in the 12th century, Pope Eugenius III. approved of the Decretals, and commanded them to be read in the universities, although they set the orbis terrarum above the Pope, and directly asserted his fallibility in matters of faith.

The Decretal "still quotes[4] the saying of S. Jerome, '[5] If authority be looked for, the world is greater than the city.'" The gloss says, "[6] And here is an argument that the statutes of a council overrule a statute of a Pope, if they are contradictory." The celebrated Decretal, "Si Papa," quotes from a writer of the xith century; "[7] The Pope is to be judged by none, unless he be found to err from the faith [a fide devius]." Another decretal quotes a letter from S. Gregory the Great, in which he condemns an injunction of Pelagius II., of which he says, "[8] This seems to me harsh and incompetent." A gloss says, "This constitution was unjust;" and on the word "harsh," "The statute of Pelagius was against the Gospel." Gratian himself says, "[9] This (on the authority of the decretal Epistles of Popes) is to be understood of

[2] Bossuet Def. vii. 33. ib. p. 277.

[3] Gelas. Ep. 13, ad Episc. Dard. Conc. iv. 1204, 1205. Eirenicon iii. p. 278.

[4] Dist. xciii. c. 24.

[5] "Orbis major est urbe." S. Jerome Ep. cxlvi. ad Evang. Opp. i. 1076 Vall.

[6] Boss. App. ad defens. i. 6.

[7] Dist. xl. c. 6.

[8] Dist. xxxi. c. 1. Ib.

[9] Dist. xix. 7.

those Sanctions or decretal Epistles in which nothing is found contrary to the decrees of preceding fathers or the precepts of the Gospel."

The objects for which the Council of Constance was assembled forced upon it a question which, except in a diseased state of things, could never occur; whether a Council was superior to a Pope or a Pope to a Council. For both a Council as the representative of the whole Church, and the Bishop of Rome as having from old times a Primacy in it, ought to be of one mind. Being called together, as the last resource to end the long schism between the Popes at Rome and at Avignon, the Council had to decide between the claims of three anti-popes or, if necessary, to obtain the resignation of all. It was therefore, by its office, superior to all.

The anti-popes, whose cession it had to obtain, were each of them a disgrace to the Papacy. The worst was John XXIII., whose name stands in the list of Bishops of Rome, who had convened the Council, and who fled from it when the list of crimes imputed to him, some of which he owned and some denied, was privately circulated. *We* naturally cannot think much of a Council which induced the Emperor Sigismund to break his safe-conduct to Huss. The Council, however, gave rise to the subsequent discussions as to the superiority of a Council to the Pope. It said, "[1] This holy Synod of Constance, being lawfully called together in the Holy Spirit, constituting a General Council and representing the Catholic Church, has its power immediately from Christ, and every one, of whatever state or dignity, *even if it be Papal,* is bound to obey it in what appertains to the Faith and to the extirpation of the said schism and the reformation of the said Church in its head and its members." It also enacted, "that if any one of any condition, state, dignity whatever, *even if Papal,* should contumaciously refuse to obey the precepts of this

[1] Conc. Const. Sess. v.

sacred Synod or any other General Council soever lawfully called, he should be subjected to condign penitence unless he repented, and should be duly punished even by recourse to other aids of law if need be."

The discussion as to the relative superiority of a Council or a Pope lasted long. With regard to individuals, it is remarkable that those who held the Pope to be superior to the Synod did not hold his infallibility. I will give the summary in the words of a Roman Catholic writer before the Council[2]:

"[3]Panormitan, '[4]the light of the law,' his master Cardinal Zabarella, Cardinal Cusa, Alphonsus Tostato, '[5] the amazement of the world,' nor less 'distinguished for holiness,' his countryman Alphonsus de Castro, and Pope Adrian VI. (not to mention many other great names), have left writings hostile to the view of papal infallibility. All this is admitted by Ultramontane controversialists of the sixteenth century, before Bossuet was born. But the most extreme partisans of the papacy, those who asserted the papal infallibility in the strongest terms, really held it as little as the most determined Gallicans. Turrecremata certainly teaches that the 'judgement of the Roman pontiff cannot err in those things which are of faith.' But this is only one side of his teaching. Another and not less important side of that teaching is, that a pope may be convicted of pertinacity in heresy, '*si errorem definit solenniter* et a Christianis asserit tanquam Catholicum esse tenendum.' He reconciles the two propositions by a third, namely, that if a Roman pontiff becomes a heretic, by the very fact, through which he falls from the faith of Peter, he falls from the chair and See of Peter, and consequently the judgement of such a heretic would not be the judgement of the Apostolic See. Hugo, Bishop of Ferrara, one of the most authoritative canonists, had already laid down the

[2] As it is a mere statement of facts, there is nothing for a R. C. to retract.

[3] See more at length in Bossuet App. ad defens. decl. Cleri Gall. i. 8.

[4] Labb. de Scriptt. Eccl.

[5] 'stupor mundi.' Bell. de Scriptt. Eccl. a. 1440.

rule, 'quod si papa hæreticus est, in eo quod hæreticus est, est minor quolibet Catholico,' and this is repeated by an immense number of mediæval writers of all parties. S. Augustine of Ancona in his *Summa* argues at length that 'sicut homo mortuus non est homo, ita papa deprehensus in hæresi non est papa; quod ipso facto est depositus.' The arguments of Augustine are also reproduced by a multitude of later writers. Ulrich of Strasburg, quoted by Turrecremata, says that 'the pope's authority ceases through infidelity to the Rock, upon which the authority of Peter is established.' Peter de Palude, whom the pope made Patriarch of Jerusalem, says that 'when the pope falls into heresy, he is (eo ipso) cut off from the church, ceases to be pope, and is de facto deposed.' This is also the doctrine of S. Raymond of Penafort, who teaches that every heretic, 'seu *occultus*, seu *manifestus*,' is ipso jure excommunicate with the greater excommunication, and incurs deposition, 'sive sit clericus, sive laicus, papa vel imperator.' It is also the doctrine of the great canonist Johannes Andreæ. The extravagant Spanish Franciscan, Alvarez Pelagius, at first says that 'no crime deprives the pope of the papacy *ipso jure*, not even heresy, if he consents to be corrected,' but afterwards allows 'quod papa hæreticus inferior est quolibet catholico,' and therefore a council might condemn him. 'Or in such a case a sentence is not necessary; *for* pertinacious heresy ipso jure deprives one of a benefice, immo privatus est a jure.' Antonio de Rosellis, a partisan of Pope Eugenius, proves at length by arguments taken from the canonists, that the papal dignity is lost by heresy. He says it is perfectly true that the pope is above a council, that his judgement is superior to that of a council which derives its whole authority from him, and that an inferior may not judge a superior; but 'hæc sunt vera, præterquam cum agitur causa fidei vel boni universalis ecclesiæ.' Peter de Monte, Bishop of Brescia, a contemporary of Turrecremata, proves that a pope by heresy 'desiit esse Papa et caput ecclesiæ.' On this point there was no difference

between the fiercest opponents of the popes in the middle ages and their strongest partisans. The rebellious Franciscan Michael de Cesena laid it down as universally accepted truth, that 'Papa contra doctrinam fidei Catholicæ docens sive statuens in sententiam excommunicationis damnationis privationis incurrit ipso facto.' And Ockham uses the identical words which I have quoted from Cardinal Turrecremata, that a pope may be convicted of pertinacity in heresy, 'si errorem quem contra fidem diffinit solenniter à Christianis asserit tanquam Catholicum esse tenendum.' When two such writers as Ockham and Turrecremata agree on such a point, it is certain that they express the universal, or almost universal sentiment[6].—The great Carmelite theologian Waldensis not only admits the fallibility of the pope and of the Roman Church, but thinks that even an ecumenical council confirmed by the pope requires the consent of the universal Church before its decrees can be considered irreformable." S. Antoninus who was alleged as saying, 'The Pope in those things which appertain to the faith cannot err,' admits that it might be '[7] that a Pope should be a heretic, and will to enact what is heretical.' Card. Jacobatius, whom Leo X. left as his Vicar at Rome, when he himself went to Bologna to treat of peace with Francis I., still puts the case,—'[8] If we are in a case of faith, and the Pope willeth to enact any thing contrary to faith, the sentence of the Council must rather be abided by,' And says,—'[9] When the Pope is a heretic, he must be accused and declared deposed.'"

Down to the close of the Vatican Council, authority was

[6] Turrecremata Summa L. iv. p. ii. c. 6; Hugo in can. Si Papa; Augustin. Triumph. Summ. qu. 5; S. Raimundi Summ. tit. de hær. 2; Alvar. Pelag. de Planctu Eccles. i. 4, 34; Anton. de Rosell. Monarch. part ii. cap. 14 and 21; de Monte, Monarchia, in the Apparatus to Labbe's Concilia; Occam Dialog. lib. iv. cap. 29. Augustine of Ancona says, that it belongs to the pope to interpret 'quæ sunt dubia et obscura in fide;' but he adds, 'illa tamen conditione servata quod nec præceptis Evangelicis sit contrarium, nec decretis sanctorum Patrum inveniatur adversum.' And Alvarez Pelagius, ii. 10, proves that a Pope may err, by the cases of Anastasius and Liberius.

[7] iii. tit. 33. c. 3. n. 4. [8] de conc. L. vi. p. 238. [9] Ib. p. 240.

with the Church. "[1] Changing the constitution," said a French Bishop during the Council, "you are obliged to change also the doctrine, and it will be necessary hereafter to chant in the Holy Sacrifice *Credo Papam* instead of *Credo Ecclesiam.*"

Facts went the same way. The case of Honorius alone was spoken of in the Council. It was evidently felt as a sore point. It was got over in the old way of alleged falsification of documents. The expedient that he did not speak ex cathedra, did not occur to any one. This would have been to admit the error. It was also too contrary to facts. The letter of Sergius, the heretical patriarch of Constantinople, to Honorius, as well as those which he wrote to Cyrus or Sophronius, and the letter of Honorius to him, were spoken of by the VIth General Council as dogmatic writings. Sergius in his letter to Honorius set down his own belief written with great care, and set forth how Cyrus Patriarch of Alexandria had won back to the Church many Eutychians by proposing to them,—in fact, Monothelism; how Sophronius had remonstrated against this, speaking of two operations in Christ; how he himself had exhorted Cyrus "not to allow any one to speak of one or two operations in Christ our God," seeing that the word "two operations" scandalised many, and that to speak of "two wills" suggested the thought of two contrary human wills [not of a Divine and Human Will]. This he laid before Honorius, entreating him to read it carefully and in his love, according to the grace given him "by God, to fill up any deficiency, and through your holy syllables to signify[2] what seems good to you as to these matters[3]."

Sophronius Patriarch of Jerusalem, being himself detained by the irruption of the Saracens, sent Bishop Stephen to Rome, having solemnly adjured him to "make known to the most holy man all the commotions here [in the East] and to give them no rest until they *canonically* effect an

[1] Mgr. Maret. ii. 375. [2] σημᾶναι

[3] Ep. Sergii ad Honor. Conc. Const. iii. Act xii. T. vii. 952—960. Col.

entire destruction of the adscititious doctrines[4]." So appealed to, Honorius formally, in an answer to the heretical patriarch, expressed his entire agreement with him, and accepted his letter condemning not only the true language but the true belief[5], and wrote to Sophronius, to desist from using the true language. If this was *not* speaking ex Cathedra, it is for the defenders of Papal infallibility to say what *is*. But the language of Sergius was identical with or adopted in the Ecthesis of Heraclius and the Type of Constans, which Pope Martin condemned and for condemning which he suffered death. So that Pope Martin condemned what Pope Honorius had acquitted.

On the other hand, the usual resource in perplexity, the imputation of interpolation, is absolutely precluded by the independence of the authorities[6]. The imputation of heresy is attested by Pope Leo II. in accepting the sixth General Council and in Epistles to the Spanish Bishops and the Spanish king; by another Pope in his Profession of faith on entering his office; by Pope Adrian II., to justify the condemnation of Honorius; by the seventh and eighth General Councils (of which the eighth was entirely under Roman influence); by the framers of the Roman Breviary before its revise by Pius V. and Clement VIII. Had Honorius not been guilty, this had been a prolonged false witness of about 900 years[7].

2. Again, Pope Gregory II. can hardly be said not to have pronounced ex cathedra, when he gave answer that if a wife were, for a time, disabled from conjugal duties, a person might marry a second wife, which the Council of Trent expressly forbade[8]. For he wrote his direction as to the

[4] Libell. Steph., Ep. Dor. in Conc. Later. Secr. ii. Conc. vii., 108, 109. Col.

[5] "It is very absurd to *think* or to speak of there being or having been one or two operations in the Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus." Ep. 2 ad Serg. in Conc. Const. iii. Act. xiii. fin. Conc. viii. 1002. Col.

[6] "Whoever reads Garnier will readily be convinced, that not even the slightest suspicion of any such adulteration or suppositiousness of the epistles can be admitted." Perrone Prælect. T. ii. p. i. p. 557 note.

[7] See authorities in full in Eirenicon iii. 189-200.

[8] Sess. 24, Can. 2.

infant German Church, "[9] out of the authority [vigore] of the Roman see," and calls his doctrine "the doctrine of the Apostolic authority [vigoris], through the blessed Peter from whom was the beginning of the Apostolate and Episcopate." And yet Gratian says, "that of S. Gregory is found absolutely opposed to the sacred canons, yea to Evangelic and Apostolic doctrine [1]."

3. Celestine III. taught that marriage was dissolved by heresy. This was contradicted by Innocent III.; and Celestine's words were removed from the Decretals for their error [2].

4. John XXII. contradicted with ridicule a decretal of Nicholas III. and was accused of heresy by the Franciscans for contradicting what had once been defined by a supreme Pontiff. John XXII. tried to excuse Nicolas, but justified himself in another decretal [3].

5. The same John XXII. publicly preached at Rome what was declared to be heresy; others preached the same, following him. Philip VI. of France with the Masters of Paris contradicted him. John retracted on his death-bed, and Benedict XII. asserted that what he had maintained was heresy [4].

6. Stephen VI. annulled the ordinations of Formosus, denying him to have been a true Pope, pronounced all his acts invalid, and compelled those whom he had ordained to be reordained; John IX., with a Council of Bishops, annulled the sentence of Stephen VI.; Sergius III. reaffirmed it [5].

7. Stephen II. gave a response which implied that marriage with a lady of birth was lawful to one who had previously married a servant-maid; and another in which he pronounced Baptism with wine in the absence of water, in extremis, valid [6].

[9] Greg. ii. Ep. ix. ad Bonifac. n. 2, Conc. Gall. i. 519, Boss.

[1] Gratian Caus. xxxii. q. 7, c. 18.

[2] See authorities in Eirenicon iii. 207.

[3] See authorities in Eirenicon pp. 210-215.

[4] See Ib. 215-218.

[5] Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. iv. 12, col. 1024, 1025. Eiren. iii. 204, 205.

[6] See authorities Eiren. iii. 202.

8. Nicholas I. gave as a response to the infant Church of the Bulgarians, that Baptism in the name of Christ alone was sufficient [7].

9. Alexander III. declared that he judges contrary to some of his predecessors in a question of marriage [8].

The fall of Liberius was different from these. It was a terrible fall. He knew and held the truth, but denied it. He strengthened, not his brethren, but those who denied his Lord. But it was as Bishop of Rome, that his assent was desired and his agreement with the Arians obtained; as Bishop of Rome, he signed the heretical Creed, rejected the communion of S. Athanasius, and professed himself at peace and in concord with the worst enemies of the faith. "Anathema to thee, thou prevaricator Liberius," burst forth S. Hilary in relating his sad history [9].

The case of Sergius was again different. He had purchased the Papacy and obtained a large sum of money (700 pounds of gold) on condition that he would abrogate the Council of Chalcedon and receive into communion some of the Monophysite heretics (the Acephali). He promised part of his bribe (200 pounds of gold) to Belisarius, on condition that he would remove Sylverius and make him Pope in his stead; Belisarius, having at first banished Sylverius, gave him into the hands of Sergius, who removed him to the Isle of Palmaria, where he died of starvation and was held to be a martyr. Sergius, bound by his promise, wrote privately to the heads of the Acephali, declaring that he held the same faith with them; and in his confession of faith, which he begged them to keep secret, declared himself a Monophysite, anathematised those who held the two natures in Christ, and rejected the Epistle of S. Leo which the Council of Chalcedon had received. Publicly he accepted what privately he had rejected [1].

In him we have only the vacillations of one who had been a bad man. He wished to hold with the Westerns

[7] Ib. 203-206. [8] Ib. 208, 209. [9] See authorities Ib. pp. 187—189.

[1] Fleuri H. E. L. xxxii. 57.

by saving the credit of the Council of Chalcedon; and with those who promoted him, by condemning what they wished to have condemned, certain teaching of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Ibas, and Theodoret ("the three chapters"). He had promised to the Empress Theodora to join in their condemnation, and was of this mind in Sicily. Arrived at Constantinople, for some reason, he changed his mind, and at first rejected the communion of Mennas for four months, because he had condemned them: then he condemned them himself in a formal writing which he entitled "Judicatum:" upon this the Bishops of Africa excommunicated him. Vigilius withdrew his Judicatum and proposed the holding of a Council. "[2] Without the consent of all, I will in no wise acquiesce to do alone what both occasions the Council of Chalcedon to be called in question, and occasions scandal to my brethren." The Council was assembled with his consent; he promised to take part in it. He preferred to send in his answer apart; he did send it after the 6th session. His "Constitutum" contained 60 anathemas against sayings of Theodorus, but forbids that he should be condemned by name; he wills that nothing should be said in derogation of Theodoret, but proposes certain Anathemas, and acquits Ibas on ground of the Council of Chalcedon. In conclusion he forbids any cleric to teach any thing against this Constitutum, and annuls any thing which had been written. Nineteen days afterwards, the Council anathematised "Theodorus and his impious writings, and what Theodoret had impiously written against the right faith and the 12 anathematisms of Cyril, and the godless Epistle of Ibas." In fine they threaten deposition to any Bishop or Clerk, anathematise any layman who should contradict the decrees of the Synod. Seven months afterwards, Vigilius accepted the sentence of the Synod, confessing that the enemy of mankind had separated him from his Colleagues, the Bishops assembled at Constantinople. In it he "condemned the Epistle said to be by Ibas." About

[2] Ep. Cler. Ital. ad legat. Franc. (post Conc. Met.) Conc. v. 1199. Col.

6 weeks after this, Vigilius in a laboured writing, which also he called "Constitutum," by an artificial train of reasoning maintained that the Epistle attributed to Ibas was a forgery, and not that, after reading which the Papal legates pronounced Ibas orthodox[3].

These judgements were all formal judgements, as their names "Judicatum," "Constitutum," imply. Yet they contradicted one another; Vigilius justified himself by the example of S. Augustine, who "[4] reconsidered his own writings and corrected his sayings," and said, "[5] by the definition of this our present writing we evacuate whatever has been done either by me or by others in defence of the three chapters aforesaid."

Pelagius II. justified the variation on the ground, that the change of one seeking the truth is not to be blamed. "[6] If in the matter of the 3 chapters one thing was said when truth was being sought, another when truth was found, why is change of judgement imputed as a fault to this See, which is reverenced in its author by the whole Church? For not change of judgement, but inconstancy of mind is matter of blame. When then the intention of seeking what is right remains unchanged, why should one not, quitting his ignorance, change his language?"

But in this defence of Vigilius, and the see of Rome in him to those who kept aloof from it on account of its accepting the condemnation of the 3 chapters, Pelagius admits that the prior sentence given by Vigilius was in ignorance. And yet this statement is not borne out by facts, since he had condemned 'the three chapters' long before in the Judicatum; his later thoughts were to excuse them.

Some of these instances do not go counter to the letter of the Vatican Council, since that pronounced the Roman pontiff to be infallible, when he speaks ex cathedra, i. e. "[7] when, discharging the office of Supreme Pontiff and

[3] See more fully Mgr Maret du Concile Général et de la paix réligieuse. i. 263. sqq. translated Eirenicon iii. 269-271.

[4] Ep. decretalis Vigilii Papæ pro confirm. v. Synod. Conc. vi. 242. Col.

[5] Ib. 246. [6] Ep. ad Episc. Istriæ. [7] de Ecclesia c. iv.

Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine on faith or morals to be held by the whole Church." But unless some of them were valid, the question of Papal infallibility, which it seemed to Pius IX. and the majority of the Bishops present at the Council of so much importance to affirm, would be reduced into very narrow limits. For they include formal responses, when consulted; answers "out of the authority of the Roman See," "decretals." Probably they will be forgotten (as, except the case of Honorius, they were forgotten at the Vatican Council), or remembered only as a ground why the Papal infallibility should have been decreed. Certainly while, in the cases in which Bishops of Rome have confessedly erred in responses as to faith or morals, some have not, in the letter, come up to the words of the Council, "a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church," on the other hand infallibility was claimed beforehand for all the eighty propositions of the syllabus; and to retain these, as well as the "Apostolic decrees of the last three centuries," was alleged as the special ground for decreeing the Papal infallibility then [8].

"[9] That is opportune which is necessary; but after so many attacks, the definition of infallibility is necessary; for if it were omitted, many would think it not so certain; whence the Apostolic diplomas of the last three centuries and the present Syllabus, put out by the holy pontiff Pius IX., will lose their authority; which would be a very great evil, than which no greater could be feared from the governments: even if those things were true, which some say are to be feared from them, if the definition is made."

But although Papal infallibility under these circumstances be alone guarded by anathema, the doctrine itself

[8] "Kagerer relates to me that P. Roh the Jesuit and Theologian of B. Martin of Paderborn had visited him and said, 'The Papal infallibility would never have come to be treated of in the Council, unless it had been so strongly disputed, and now even by Bishops': he named Dupanloup and Maret." Friedrich Tagebuch p. 26.

[9] Annotationes n. 24 in Friedrich Tagebuch p. 368.

sanctioned by the Council cannot be so confined. The Pope is recognised as the Vicar of Jesus Christ: he was popularly said to be the "sensible Presence of Jesus Christ among us." Ferraris in his digest of Pontifical law says, "[1] The Pope is of such dignity and exaltedness that he is not simple man, but, as it were, God and Vicar of Christ. The Pope, for the excellence of his supreme dignity, is called—Divine Monarch and supreme Emperor and King of kings... Whatsoever the Pope doth, seemeth to proceed out of the mouth of God. The Pope is, as it were, God upon earth." Were he an Apostle, S. Peter, or S. Paul, or S. John, who were taught by the Holy Ghost, and spoke as they were moved by Him, who could mentally draw a line, in which he was inspired, where he ceased to be inspired? None but the infallible person himself could place any conditions, upon which his infallibility should depend, or assign limits to it.

Pius IX. certainly wrote the Syllabus as being, what he always believed himself to be, infallible. It was not said in terms, but implied; so that an infallibilist claimed the acceptance of the Encyclical without noticing this implied claim as an admission of it[2]. According to this, which was used as a ground for pronouncing the Vatican decree, the subject-matter of papal infallibility far surpassed that laid down by Bellarmine and in the Vatican decree itself, 'faith and morals.'

The claim was put forth, 13 years ago, in an infallibilist organ[3]. It was clearly drawn out,

1. "That Pius IX. claims infallibility in judgements which he puts forth, 'which do *not* touch the dogmas of faith and morals,' but 'whose object is declared [by him] to regard the Church's right discipline and general good.' 'His declarations on his civil princedom [i.e. on 'his temporal sovereignty over his temporal subjects in Italy'] may

[1] Biblioth. Jurid. v. Papa.

[2] Dublin Review April 1865. p. 447. quoted Eirenicon i. p. 289.

[3] Ib. pp. 444, 446, 448. Eiren. i. pp. 292, 293.

be given as instances in point.' These statements of infallible truth need not, then, obviously be connected with the substance of revelation, or be supported by any thing in Holy Scripture or tradition, bearing on the subject.

2. "That these statements, in order to their infallibility, need not be addressed to the whole Episcopate, or be in any way formal in their character, but may be contained in letters to this or that individual pastor.

3. "That consequently all the statements put forth in the Syllabus of 1864 are infallible truth.

4. "It follows that Papal infallibility is held to extend to matters of fact, and with things unconnected with former revelation.

5. "Since the claim for infallibility in these statements has been put forth, although not 'totidem verbis,' in the Encyclical of 1864, then, it is to follow, that each successive Pope is infallible on any of those or the like subjects, in whatsoever way or to whomsoever he may speak."

It extends [4] to matters of fact, to religious toleration by a R. C. state, the denial of any "power" of the Church "to use force against persons," or "corrective power to the intent that those in error may return into the way of righteousness," the civil jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, the "sinfulness of the political principle of non-intervention," whence Card. Manning declared "[5] that the English government, as proclaiming the principle of non-intervention in the Roman question, thereby denies the Divine authority of the Church, and assumes an attitude towards Christianity and the Church, and towards the Christian Society, which gives it at this moment the melancholy pre-eminence of being the most Anti-Catholic, and therefore, if not in its intentions, certainly in its influences and results, the most Anti-Christian power in the world."

They lie in the words of Pius IX. who has since been pronounced infallible. Formerly an Ultramontane called

[4] Eirenicon i. pp. 293—301.

[5] Introd. to Sermons on Eccl. subjects 1863.

those "would-be-Doctors" who "[6] without any solid foundation wished by flattery to equal the Popes, as it were, to God." Now "[7] one writing to the Catholics of Pius IX's own diocese, by his express sanction, and under his very eye, claims for the Encyclical, and consequently, for every like expression of the Pope's mind, to be *the very word of God*, to be received on pain of forfeiting heaven."

And yet this has its own difficulty. It cuts away on the one side all the excuses for those answers of Popes which have been acknowledged to be erroneous or even heretical; on the other, it stamps as God's Word, sayings of Popes which subsequent sayings or acts of Popes have contradicted.

S. Gregory the Great formally declares, on the ground of Leviticus, c. 18, that marriage with a sister-in-law is forbidden, "[8] because through her former union she became the brother's flesh." In a formal answer to an enquiry of S. Augustine of Canterbury, "at what degree of consanguinity may the faithful marry, and may marriage be contracted with step-mothers or sisters-in-law?" he prohibits, on ground of Divine law, marriage with the sister-in-law, as well as with the mother-in-law. Alexander VI. gave a dispensation to marry a sister-in-law.

S. Leo I. spoke of his own clear statement of doctrine, as "[9] confirmed by the irreversible assent of the whole brotherhood:" the Vatican Council declares that the utterances of the Pope are irreformable in themselves, *not through the consent of the Church.* S. Gregory the Great was infallible when he declared that the See of S. Peter existed equally in Rome and Alexandria and Antioch[1]; and when he expressed his abhorrence of the word "command" as applied to himself, since "he did not command but simply indicated

[6] "adulando eos quasi æquiparare Deo." Turrecremata calls them "Doctorculi."

[7] Card. Patrizi quoted in Dubl. Rev., April, 1865.

[8] Epistt. L. xi. Indict. iv. Ep. 64. Interr. 6. Opp. ii. 1154. Ben.

[9] Ep. 52, Episc. Gall. Conc. iv. 581. Col.

[1] Ep. ad Eulog. Episc. Alex. Epp. vii. ep. 40. Opp. ii. 888.

what seemed useful;" and that he declined the title of "[2] Universal" Pope, as had predecessors of his, for that "his honour was the honour of the universal Church, and the solid strength [vigor] of my brethren;" and S. Leo IX. when he utterly rejected the proud name of universal Apostle, "[3] *by which their equality of rank seemed to be taken away from all Prelates throughout the world,* in that out of the whole a claim was made for one;" and S. Leo, when he said that *the Lord Jesus was alone born* "[4] *innocent* among the sons of men, because He *alone* was conceived without the pollution of carnal concupiscence;" and Innocent III., when he said "[5] one (Eve) was produced without fault, but produced unto fault; but this one (Mary) *was produced in fault,* but produced without fault. That one was said to be *Eva;* to this one was said *Ave.*" It must be explained, how Pope S. Gelasius said, "[6] the substance or nature of bread ceaseth not to be" in "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," and how Pope Nicholas II. pronounced, with Anathema to its denial, that "[7] the Body and Blood of Christ can be *sensibly* (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, or broken or crushed by the teeth of the faithful."

In view of these difficulties, it was held at the Vatican Council (as we must think by a petitio principii) that Papal infallibility was a truth divinely revealed and so that facts of history must give way.

[2] Ep. ad Eulog. Epp. viii. Ep. 30, p. 919.

[3] Ep. i. ad Michael. Ep. Const. n. 9, Conc. xi. 1324. Col.

[4] Serm. 5, de Nat. Dom. c. 5. p. 86.

[5] In solemn. Assumpt. glor. semper Virg. M. Serm. 2, Opp. T. i. p. 151. It is said in his History that the Sermons were preached, while he was Pope, and implied in the Prologue to his sermons. The Abbé Migne says, "So could Pope Innocent think as to a matter, not as yet defined by the Church, which now is of faith." See Eiren. ii. 196, 197.

[6] de duabus in Christo Naturis adv. Eut. et Nest. B. P. viii. 703 quoted by S. Fulgentius in the De 5 quæstt. ad Ferrand. B. P. ix. 187.

[7] "et sensualiter non solum sacramento sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari et fidelium dentibus atteri" in the oath "Ego Berengarius," taken by him in the Roman Council, A. D. 1059, on the teaching of Pope Nicholas.

"[7] From monuments above all exception, as was declared above, the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs is a truth Divinely revealed. It cannot be then, that it should ever be demonstrated to be false by any facts of history whatsoever; and if any facts of history are opposed to it, they are without any doubt to be accounted false, as far as they seem to be opposed to it.

"2. Add to this, that since the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is known through plain and most certain sources to be a Divine truth, and so to be original and simply ancient, according to the rule, then, of old laid down by Tertullian, it has by the title of possession a prescription against every opinion and conclusion opposed to it. For that, especially in causes appertaining to faith, is true, which is earliest.—But that the Infallibility of the Holy See and the Roman Pontiff belongs to a doctrine of faith is clear from the documents of faith adduced; and the contrary opinions have been more than once disapproved by the authority of the Church. The conclusions then of any science whatsoever, of ecclesiastical history also, if they are opposed to the Infallibility of Roman Pontiffs, are the more clearly to be accounted as so many errors, the more plainly this doctrine is inferred from the fountains of revelation."

True; if any doctrine was undoubtedly a revelation of God, one should suppose that one must be mistaken about one's interpretation of historical facts. But where is the evidence? "All very good," said a Theologian of Breslau at the council[8]; "but the proof from tradition? Adduce me this! In a few days I will write a great treatise in favour of Infallibility: but the proof from tradition you must excuse me." '[9] *I* am Tradition,' is a saying ascribed to Pius IX., as indeed one who is infallible must have all authority in himself. No one could except against the assertion of one infallible.

But there is no evidence. Had there been any, the whole

[7] Annotations on the scheme of infallibility No 24 in Friedrich Tagebuch p. 386.
[8] quoted Friedrich Tagebuch p. 165. [9] Ib. p. 259 note.

history of the Church would have been other. Almighty God did not will that it should be by the voice of one man, that heresies should be slain. He had an office for the Universal Church spread throughout the world. He had an office for the Church as a whole, to bear witness to the truth. One voice went up from every clime, "So have we been taught;" "Thus believes the Catholic Church;" "[1] and thereupon they confessed how the faith lay, in order to shew that their own sentiments were not novel, but Apostolical; and what they wrote down, was no discovery of theirs, but is the same as was taught by the Apostles."

The Council of Nice was a wonderful assembly. "[2] There were at that time, many, eminent for Apostolic gifts; many too, who, according to the Divine Apostle, 'bore about in the body the marks of the Lord Jesus.' James of Nisibis both raised the dead to life, and did very many other miracles. Paul Bishop of Neo-cæsarea had experienced the fury of Licinius, his hands powerless, the red-hot iron had destroyed the power of motion; others had their right eyes dug out, others were hamstrung in the knees, of whom was Paphnutius. A crowd of martyrs might be seen gathered in one."

But all the Bishops, however endowed, learned or unlearned, knew the faith of Christ. And the faith, which they attested, surmounted every shock; the violence of Roman or Persian Emperors, of Gothic or Vandal kings, or the wiles of heretics, or gatherings of heretical Bishops, because it was builded on the Rock which was Christ. Petrus super petram, non petra super Petrum. The faith in Christ, Son of God and, for us, Son of man, was the Rock, against which the gates of hell should not prevail.

So it was with the subsequent Councils. The Councils knew nothing of the infallibility of Popes: the Popes, represented in them, knew nothing of it: the Popes, who regarded the acceptance of their letters by Councils as a confirmation of them, knew nothing of it; nor those who retracted what they had said and owned their fallibility; nor the Church, when in successive Councils it

[1] S. Ath. Counc. Arim. n. 5. p. 79. [2] Theodoret H. E. i. 7.

reconsidered what Popes had said, and accepted it, not as their saying, but because it agreed with what General Councils had before decided; nor Roman Canonists when the digest of Canon law was compiled, nor very eminent Canonists subsequently. For the first time in the history of the Church, a Council was held, not to over-rule emerging heresies, and declare, over-against them, what is the true faith which the Church had ever held. For the first time a Council was held, not to subdue heresy, but to subject to anathema those who should deny what, down to the final vote of the Council, every one was free to deny and to declare to be destitute of sufficient evidence to make it a matter of faith. A compact majority was determined to carry the decree at any cost, and the minority, at one time very considerable, melted away, and retired mostly from the Council, some almost broken-hearted. "To what end to struggle against one stronger than one's self?" said Mgr. Darboy[3], who went, unknowing, to die by the hands of those, whom the Church had lost and who became its foes. Had the Council but had wisdom to heal diseases, instead of augmenting them!

The decision of the majority of the Vatican Council was owing to the strong will of one man[4]. It was said, years before, that his mind was set upon two things, to make the opinion as to the Immaculate Conception an article of faith, and to establish the belief in the Infallibility of the

[3] A very thoughtful and weighty speech of Mgr. Darboy, delivered in the general congregation of the Vatican Council, May 20, 1870, is preserved by Friedrich, Documenta, ii. 415—424.

[4] "He (Pius IX) has it in his power, fully in his power, in his sole power, to entertain or remove it, (the question of infallibility.) And if, in his high wisdom, he purely and simply rejects it, as Pius IV did at the Council of Trent, no Pope will have given a more exalted example of consummate prudence, moderation amid strength, or could more effectually have heightened his authority in the admiration of all." Mgr. Dupanloup, in the Réponse de Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans à Mgr. Dechamp p. 54, Naples 1870, quoted Friedrich p. 235. "In 1846, I am told, he (Pius IX) spoke of a general Council, and when between 1850—56, during the preparation for the definition of the Immaculata, a Dominican, among other representations, said to him, 'then must he be declared infallible,' Pius answered quick and

Pope. The decision on the Immaculate Conception was the natural preparation for, and forerunner of, the Vatican decree. One by one, the Bishops gave answer to him whom they accounted of supreme authority. Those who, for whatever reason, objected to making the opinion, so long denied by Fathers, Saints, Popes, Doctors, devotional writers, on ground of Holy Scripture, a matter of faith, were for the most part silent. There was no ground for silence on a subject, which Pius IX shewed that he had so much at heart, except an adverse conviction. In France, amid very strong adverse judgements, 41 only, out of 80, were favourable; in the United States, 3 only, out of 28; in Austria, amid earnest protests even from a Synod, out of 121 Bishops, four only, even at the instance of Card. Antonelli in the name of Pius IX, could be induced to express agreement. It was explained by the Apostolic Nuncio, that the "silence of the Archbishops of that monarchy and their suffragans could only be an argument that they were not inclined to a determination, directed to declare the pious belief of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma[5]." Yet amid this implied or expressed dissent of above 168[6] Bishops, besides others who wished for delay, Pius IX could persuade himself that "the Bishops asked of us, as it were with a common vote, that the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin herself should be defined by our supreme judgement and authority[7]."

This form of speech, in itself, implied that it rested with him, and him alone, to declare, what should be *de fide*. It was already ignoring a known and very considerable minority. Many of the Bishops had already declared their belief in it. But they had no concurrent voice. They sim-

with much emotion [ungehalten], "That too will happen." Friedrich p. 294. "Lately, in the American College, on occasion of a national festival, the Pope made a speech in which he complained quite openly of the opposition of a portion of the American Bishops, so that a Bishop said to Graf—, my authority, 'That is too bad; the Pope goes from house to house and uses constraint towards the Bishops.'" Ib. p. 155.

[5] See the details in Eirenicon i. 120—146, 351—407.

[6] The Patriarch of the Melchites in three Eastern Patriarchates, spoke besides, of "some of his Bishops" as against the decree. [7] Eiren. i. 127.

ply echoed his wish, and he acted upon the wish which they echoed. So Pius IX did, what Card. Bona, when consulted by Alexander VII [8], replied that it was impossible for him to do, to "decide what was to be believed on the Immaculate Conception," "even under inspiration of the Holy Ghost," or "bind the faithful to adhere to his decision," "as neither," Card. Bona subjoined, "can you bind me."

The first fruits of that decision singularly anticipated those of this last. The last sacraments were *then* refused to one, "[9] who, until 1855, was the oracle of Salamanca, and was held by learned men a fountain of religious wisdom, gushing forth on all sides." In this last, one has been cast out of Communion who, down to the Vatican Council, was praised for his writings in behalf of the faith by those who subsequently cast him out.

The Vatican decree revives much which had passed away, and whose revival the English Roman Catholics, 60 years ago, did not think possible. "The Pope's claim to temporal power by Divine right," says C. Butler [1], "has not perhaps at this time a single advocate." It is now with Roman Catholics infallible truth, having been declared in a Papal Bull, and acted upon in the depositions of Henry VIII. and of Elizabeth. And in detail, it is infallible truth, that the Pope has a right to depose any Prince, to require subjects to renounce their obedience, to rise in arms against him and drive him from his kingdom, to require all princes, in the virtue of holy obedience, to make war against him, empowering all to take as slaves any born in his dominions whoever they might be, and to seize their property as their own [2]. Some at the Council ap-

[8] See the very remarkable and vivid questions and answers as given by Narvaez, in Eirenicon i. 406. [9] Eirenicon i. from Narvaez.

[1] C. Butler, in Butler's Memoirs ii. 222. The English Roman Catholics obtained from the Sorbonne, the Universities of Louvain, Douai, Alcala, Salamanca, the rejection of the Pope's civil authority in England and of his right to dispense subjects from their allegiance. Butler iv. 13. The question and answers are given at length, Ibid. 439—482.

[2] The Bull of Paul III, containing these details, is in Cherubini Bullarium T. ii. p. 704, reprinted thence in Burnet's Records, Vol. I. P. ii. p. 256. sqq.

prehended that the governments might interpose against the decree of Infallibility, as affecting themselves. The Bull Unam Sanctam [of Boniface VIII.], which was repealed by Clement V., was counted an obstacle to the decree of Papal Infallibility. Cardinal Rauscher maintained that "[3] the doctrine of the Bull was in contradiction to the doctrine of the Church, as it was taught by her of old and now."

The burnings of Smithfield used to be regarded as obsolete. It was counted bigoted to name them. Burning was a civil law, although set in motion by the Church, of which the Civil power was the executioner. It is now systematically defended, to be put in force whenever it should seem expedient, or when secular powers shall be inclined to use it.

The deposition of kings was "telum imbelle sine ictu," when no civil power was strong enough to enforce it. These things bring odium on the Church, and strengthen what they cannot destroy. A persecution, which does not exterminate, is a blunder as well as a crime.

Pius IX. had been informed by the Bishops, that "[4] in the whole of civilised America" the devotion to the Blessed Virgin "had attained the highest degree, so that nothing more can be desired;" that in Cochin China '[4] our sole hope in these countries is placed in our most holy mother, from whom we expect salvation' [salus]. 'The devotion to the blessed Virgin,' says another, 'is such as is to be defined

[3] Friedrich p. 325. He refers to the Documenta ii. 388 sqq. for what the Cardinal had sent in against Papal infallibility. In p. 339 he says, "To-day a printed copy of the 'Petitio' composed by Card. Rauscher was sent to me, in which the theory of the Bulls 'Unam Sanctam' and the 'Cum ex apostolatus officio' meet with a very severe judgement. It is signed by Bishops of the most various countries." The heading to the Petition is 'A petition by many Archbishops and Bishops of France, Austria and Hungary, of Italy, England and Ireland and North America.' The names are not given in the Documenta. Friedrich says in a note, 'As matter of fact, most German Bishops signed this petition, as the Archbishops of Munich and Bamberg, and the Bishops of Augsburg, Trèves, Ermland, Breslau, Rottenburg, Mainz, Osnaburg, the Vicar Apostolic of Saxony, the Prussian Army-Bishop.' He refers too to Schulte, Die Macht der röm. Päpste über Länder &c ed. 2. Erklärung als Vorwort s. 5.

[4] Eirenicon i. p. 120.

by no bounds [5].' Some had spoken of her to him as '[6] Co-Redemptress of the human race;' one as the '[7] Complement of the Trinity.' [8] Spain and Portugal are familiarly spoken of as Marian kingdoms. He was informed, that the Priests diligently preached the doctrine. Yet he himself, by what is now to Roman Catholics infallible authority, exhorted; "[9] Let all the sons of the Catholic Church, most dear to us, hear these our words, and with *a yet more ardent* zeal of piety, religion, and love, continue to worship, invoke, pray, the most blessed Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, conceived without original stain, and to flee unto this most sweet Mother of mercy and grace, in all perils, distresses, necessities, and doubtful and anxious circumstances. For nothing is to be feared, nothing despaired of, when she is the Captain, she the Author." He himself, resting on what Roman Catholic Critics of the very highest authority doubt not to be a mistranslation [1], has now infallibly declared to those in the Roman Communion, that the most blessed Virgin '[2] bruised the serpent's head;' he himself affirms infallibly that she is '[2] constituted between Christ and His Church;' '[3] that *if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her,* because such is His Will Who hath willed that we should have everything through Mary:' and that she '[4] is the most powerful mediatress, and reconciless (conciliatrix) of the whole world with her Only-Begotten Son.'

I purposely omit all the supplemental evidence which I

[5] The Bishop of Scutari. Ib.

[6] Archbishops of Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain. Ib. pp. 152, 153.

[7] Archbishop of Trani, Pareri i. 10. Ib. i. 167.

[8] e. g. The Bishop of Lerida, 'In hoc Mariano regno.' Par. i. 168. The Bishop Guadalaxara speaks of Mexico, as 'Marian' (Par. iii. 76) and so others. Eir. i. 120. [9] Eiren. i. 180. Of course it is "by her mother's prayers." Still the confidence is immediately in her, mediately only in Jesus. His love is spoken of as towards His Mother; hers, towards the human race.

[1] I have translated De Rossi's summary of the overwhelming evidence against the reading, 'Ipsa' (from his Varr. Lectt. Vet. Test. Vol. iv. App. pp. 208, 209). Eirenicon ii. pp. 386, 387. De Rossi enumerates thirty-five Roman Catholic writers, who hold that the reading 'Ipsa' ought to be corrected; but no Roman authority would dare to amend it.

[2] Eiren. i. p. 122. [3] Ib. p. 123. [4] Ib. p. 179.

alleged in my first Eirenicon[5]. I alleged it then in illustration of the teaching, from which, in case of reunion, we wished to be exempted. A small portion only was excepted against, on the ground that the book, from which it was cited, had been placed in the Index. Twelve passages only were cited from that book, and of these one only does not occur in other writers. Why therefore, it was so placed, I know not. But it is useless to repeat any of this evidence now, since the chief of it has been made to Roman Catholics infallible truth.

All the comparisons, which so startled and distressed us, between the love of Mary and Jesus, have to Roman Catholics now received their adequate explanation, but in the sense contrary to what we hoped. Since the Council of Trent only laid down, that 'it is good and useful to pray to the saints,' we thought that such sayings, as I have here and elsewhere dwelt upon, were no part of the faith of the Roman Communion, and that therefore we need not concern ourselves with them, except to say that they were to us the main hindrance to restored communion. We could not except to any degree of love to her, whom our Redeemer loves with such special infinite love, whom in all eternity He fore-elected to be His mother. Our exception was not to the love, or to her intercession: still less, could we presume to wish or think of limiting in thought the love of such a Mother and the Son Who vouchsafed to take His flesh from her. What we excepted against was the office, popularly assigned to her, of *the* Mediatrix with the Only Mediator revealed to us in Holy Scripture or known to the Universal Church of old, our Lord and our God, Who bids us come to Him, if we are weary and heavy laden. He did not bid us to go to His Mother, rather than Himself. The words cannot be softened. When S. Alphonso says, "[6]The Father gave all judgement to the Son, and the whole office of mercy He gave to the Mother;" this would strictly be untrue, unless God had assigned to the Blessed

[5] Any who wish to see it can find it there; pp. 150—196.

[6] Gl. of M. c. i. s. 1. p. 14.

Virgin an office of love, which He did not give to His Only-Begotten Son, Whom in His Infinite Love He gave to be the Saviour of the world, in Whom "whosoever should believe should not perish but have everlasting life." When Card. Hugo said, "[7] The greater luminary is Christ, Who presides over the just; the lesser luminary is Mary, who presides over sinners;" the antithesis is misleading, if it be not meant, that Mary has some special office towards sinners which our Lord has not: the more so, since Pope Innocent III says; "[8] since then Mary is this propitious moon to sinners, if any miserable man finds himself fallen into the night of sin, let him behold the moon; let him pray to Mary." Or when it is said to her, "[9] Therefore hast thou been chosen from eternity to be the Mother of God, that thy mercy might procure salvation for those, whom the justice of thy Son could not save," the writer does not say, in words, that the *Mercy* of Jesus could not save them; but the antithesis would again be misleading, unless there were sinners, whom our Redeemer, by reason of His Justice, "could not save," but who were saved by Mary. The saying is still attributed to an early Father, and on his authority the mercy of a creature is, by implication, set above the mercy of her Creator, Who became Man to save us.

But now all this has been sanctioned by what is to Roman Catholics infallible authority. The Bull, in which Pius IX 'defined by' his 'supreme judgement and authority' the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, was addressed to all in his Communion. It was written by him as *the* Teacher of the Church. But in it he declares that 'the most Blessed Virgin' is 'constituted between Christ and His Church.' All the deliverances of the Christian Church are attributed to her. She, 'being wholly sweet and full of graces, hath ever delivered the Christian people from calamities of all sorts and from the snares and assaults of all enemies and hath rescued them from destruction.'

[7] in Gen. i. 26. G. M. c. 3. s. 2. p. 93.

[8] Serm. ii. de Ass. B. V. Opp. i. 151. See Eiren. ii. 105, 106. G. M. ib.

[9] In the Gl. of Mary. vi. 3. p. 180. this is quoted as S. Chrysostom's. Hom. de præs. B.V. In the Redemptorist edition it is obelised as not found.

The doctrine that 'the most Blessed Virgin is constituted between Christ and His Church,' justifies as infallible truth, all which we hoped were the exaggerated expressions of individuals. It is no longer a question of mere, however powerful, intercession. It is an office as distinct, as our Blessed Lord's own Mediatorial Office with the Father. As Jesus is 'the Way' to the Father, and 'no one cometh to the Father, save by' Him, so now all those sayings, that Mary is the way to Jesus and that none come to Jesus except through her [1], seem to be authenticated to Roman Catholics by what is now to them infallible truth; as infallible as the Gospels, although the only support alleged in the Gospels is our Lord's commending S. John to His Mother. What were to us formerly such startling sayings, as that '[2] God gives no grace, except through Mary;' that '[3] she is the neck, through which graces flow to the Body of Christ from Himself the Head;' that "[4] in the book of Proverbs Mary herself tells us that she possesses all the riches of God, that is to say, His mercies, that she may dispense them in favour of her lovers;" that '[5] from the time when the Virgin mother conceived in her womb the Word of God, she obtained a sort of special jurisdiction, so to say, or authority in every temporal procession of the Holy Ghost, so that no creature ever obtained grace from God, except according to the dispensation of His holy Mother;' '[6] that the Queen of heaven by right possesses the whole kingdom of her Son.' "[7] Saint Anselm [Eadmer] addressing Mary, says, 'Our Lord, O most holy Virgin, has exalted thee to such a degree, that by His favour all things that are possible to Him should be possible to thee.'" 'Yes, Mary is omnipotent,' repeats [8] Richard of S. Lawrence; 'for the queen by every law enjoys the same privileges as the king.' 'And as,' he adds, 'the power

[1] See below Sermon pp. 52, 53. note. [2] Serm. p. 55. note.
[3] G. M. c. v. § 1. p. 135. [4] Gl. Mary c. 3. p. 88.
[5] S. Bernardin. Serm. de Nat. B. M. V. c. 8. Gl. M. c. v. § 1. p. 135.
[6] Rup. L. iii. in Cant. Gl. of M. viii. 3. p. 214. [7] De excell. Virg. c. 12. G. M. c. vi. 1. p. 155. [8] De laud. Virg. iv. 29. Gl. M. ib.

of the son and that of the mother is the same, a mother is made omnipotent by an omnipotent Son.' '[9] And thus,' says S. Antoninus, 'God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but even under the dominion of Mary.' "[1] Since the mother, then, should have the same privileges as the Son, rightly has Jesus, Who is omnipotent, made Mary also omnipotent; though, of course, it is always true, that where the Son is omnipotent by nature, the Mother is only so by grace." These and the like[2], flow from what Pius IX is said to have declared infallibly. For if she is 'constituted between Christ and His Church,' then all prayers go up to Christ through her, all graces come down upon the soul through her. The saying that "[3] a Christian throws himself at her feet, [whereas he could not, as is implied, so cast himself at the Feet of Jesus] with a full confidence to find in her peace, comfort, and *pure love* without any hindrance whatever to follow its attractions," whereas "a Christian heart feels for Jesus Christ a love mixed with fear and awe, *not a pure love,* not that love, which a child feels in the bosom of his mother," is simply to be received. The choicest gift which Jesus has to give us, while yet sinners and wayfarers, is, not Himself, but His Mother. It seems to us that, when Mary is spoken of, our Lord's mediatoral Office sinks back, as it were, out of sight, and the Blessed Virgin occupies the place in regard to Him, which, when the Passion is dwelt upon, He occupies towards the Father. They even use the analogy from earthly relations, which (however obvious) we shrank from ascribing to them, as too earthly; that as one, who wished to obtain a favour

[9] De Grat. Priv. S. M. c. 20. Gl. M. ib. [1] Gl. M. Ib.

[2] In my first Eirenicon, p. 103, I quoted as from the 'Glories of Mary' that 'God has resigned into her hands (if one might say so,) His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace.' They were in the [2nd] Dublin edition of that work (p. 78) said to be "carefully revised by a Catholic Priest." They were repeated in the 3rd edition of 1837 (p. 85); and I had no reason to suspect that they were scarcely even a paraphrase of Liguori's words. This was the language recommended to British Roman Catholics in 1833 and 1837, although the words have been removed from later editions.

[3] Melia, Mary the Object of veneration confidence and imitation to all Christians. p. 260.

from a sovereign, would have recourse to a Prime Minister rather than to the Sovereign, so Mary is the fit person to apply to, in order to obtain what we need. "[4] If the first Minister in a temporal kingdom is considered the most proper person to solicit favours from the Sovereign, will Mary not be considered the proper and fit person in the kingdom of heaven, to present there, before the throne of the Most High, both public and private supplications, and obtain for us the graces we require ?"

But then we can but ask the more, where is the authority for all this ? But apart from these instances, the decree of Papal infallibility seems to open an almost boundless prospect of additional articles of faith in the future, as well as to convert in the past everything, upon which a Pope has said anything, into a matter of faith. With regard to the past, this would be embarrassing enough. In the past, every genuine statement of any Pope, however incidental, would become infallible truth, as infallible (since there can be no degrees in infallibility) as if it had been written by S. Peter or S. John. The late Pope in his Encyclical laid down eighty propositions, which must now be counted as "[5] the very Word of God." The Syllabus, which it was one object of the Vatican decree to maintain, quotes thirty-two documents, Allocutions and Epistles, all as of equal and binding authority. It was distinctly declared that it was "[6] contrary to the Catholic dogma of the full power divinely given to the Roman Pontiff by the Lord Christ Himself, of feeding ruling and governing the Universal Church, to contend that, without sin, assent and obedience may be withheld from those judgements and decrees of the Apostolic See, whose object is declared to be the general good of the Church, its rights and discipline, provided that that object does not touch upon dogmas of faith and morals." Card. Manning anticipated in 1865, that "[7] the dogmatic

[4] Melia Ib. p. 290.

[5] See Card. Patrizi quoted Dublin Review April 1865 p. 449.

[6] Recueil d'Allocutions &c. citées dans l'Encycl. et syll. 1864. p. 10.

[7] Pastoral, as published in the Weekly Register, June 17. 1865.

Bull of the Immaculate Conception and the Encyclical of last year will mark an epoch in the re-constitution of the Christian order of the world." The Pope is, according to him, to be continually declaring new matters of faith, to be believed, without authority of Scripture or tradition, on his sole authority, or supposed to have authority of Scripture or tradition, solely because he declares them.

One special misery of this new dogma of "Infallibility" is that it is, to such an extent, grounded on forgery. Of old no one doubted the genuineness of the forged decretals: now, no one defends them. They were first alleged by Hincmar about A.D. 860 in behalf of his own metropolitan rights: they were employed against him in the following year by Pope Nicholas I. It is difficult to imagine how a Bishop of Rome, not without learning, could have thought them to be genuine, since there could have been in the papal archives no vestige of the long unbroken series of letters or of decrees of Councils which they embodied. The Roman Catholic historian Fleuri has detailed at length the change which they made in the relations of Rome to the Western Churches[8]. A thousand years passed before they have had their full effect; but, without the forged Decretals, the Papal Infallibility never could have become a doctrine of the Roman Communion.

It is a childlike state of mind to believe everything proposed to belief, because it is proposed. But it is a great strain on belief, that, because any one be chosen as Bishop of Rome, whatever his antecedents, sins, crimes, he is, at once, a god upon earth, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, whereas some of the Popes of the middle ages were more like the heathen gods, Jupiter or Mars, than images of the Living God. Whether these claims will prepare for the Coming of Christ, or, by their oppressiveness on belief, of His last antagonist, the Anti-Christ, God, the Omniscient, only knows.

Bishops from every part of the world deprecated making the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception an article of

[8] Quatrième Discours, prefixed to vol. xvi. of his Histoire Eccles. L. lxv. ed. 12mo. translated, in part, Eirenicon i. pp. 237—255.

faith, or by their silence to the enquiries of Pius IX implied their dissent; some deprecated it, as fearing loss of souls. The decree of the Pope's personal infallibility was opposed at one time by a minority of 200 Bishops [9]; a number, larger than those of the Second General Council and equal to those of the Third. The minority had only the choice of retiring from the Council and withdrawing their opposition or making a schism [1]. "[2] Aliud est obedire, aliud credere," was the saying of the highly-gifted Archbishop Darboy, although obedience in a matter of faith, apart from acceptance of the faith, is but an outward submission. They were many, (it was understood at the time) who in Germany were driven into unbelief. Our Lord's words, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" sadly overshadow the future of the world, which He became Incarnate and died to redeem.

[9] "It is not probable that the Opposition, which now counts about 200 votes, will increase." Friedrich p. 56.

[1] "Card. Rauscher said that he was fully convinced that it (the majority) would not be kept back from taking the last step, and the Pope too would not give up his favourite idea. 'What then?' I said. 'I know not,' was the answer, 'I, at least, for my part, will make no schism, but will, to the best of my power, contribute to soften it.' In this conversation we have plainly indicated the sore spot of the Minority. 'I, for my part, will make no schism.' This will be their ruin." Friedrich p. 233.

[2] "It is one thing to obey, another to believe." It was repeated to me by one to whom he said it.

The little regard shewn by the majority is shewn by the protest made and signed by sixty-seven Archbishops and Bishops at the Council [1]. It was not directly on the point of the personal and sole infallibility of the Pope, but on what might seem a mere change in the order of proceeding. The Protest sets forth that,

"In the General Congregation of the Vatican Council, April 29, their Eminences, the Presidents, pronounced that the order of the scheme as to the Church of Christ

[1] Documenta ad ill. Conc. Vat. ii. p. 392.

was to be abandoned, and that the first subject to be treated of was Chapter XI of that scheme, and the decree added to it, i. e. of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, separately and apart from the connection between the rights and prerogatives of the Primacy with other doctrines as to the Church."

It was not, in fact, a mere question of order but of the substitution of the personal and sole infallibility of the Pope for the inerrancy of the Church, viz. that our Lord, by His promises that He would be with His Apostles and their successors to the end of the world, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church, guaranteed that the whole Church should not fall into error, destructive of His truth.

'[2] According to the original scheme,' (those Bishops say), 'proposed on March 6th, it was to be defined that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff relates to the same object as the infallibility of the Church.' Their plea then was, that, 'without a manifest disturbance of the logical order, this object [of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff] could not be defined, unless the subject of the Church, and the object to which the infallibility of the Church extends, were first treated of.'

The result of this change of order was, that the Church was excluded altogether from having any part in the doctrine of [2] infallibility thenceforth to be held *de fide*. But for this change, the office of the Church throughout the world in preserving the faith against any emerging heresies must have been first laid down: as it was, that office, in the form of the Decree ultimately adopted, was altogether denied as a heresy [3]. The Church thenceforth is simply a recipient of what the Roman Pontiff authoritatively promulgate.

The sixty-seven Bishops probably foresaw that issue. They protest against it, beforehand, because they had found petitions useless.

[2] Documenta ad ill. Conc. Vat. ii. p. 394.

[3] The new article of faith at first ran; 'that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex Cathedra* (i. e. when, discharging the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians he, out of his supreme Apostolic authority, defines that any doctrine on faith or morals is to be held by the Universal Church) through the Divine assistance promised to him in S. Peter, possesses that infallibility, with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be provided in defining doctrine as to faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are in themselves irreformable.' The words "not from consent of the Church" were added, subsequently on July 15, to make the exclusion of the Church more definite, and were inserted in the definitive decree, July 18, without consulting the Council (Documenta ad illustr. Conc. Vat. ii. 318). On this follows the Anathema, "if any one should presume to contradict this our definition" [including the statement that the Papal Infallibility is wholly independent of the consent of the Church] "let him be anathema."

They conclude,

"[4] It suffices us to have set forth this our persuasion, without adding any petition. For we can no longer reconcile it with our Episcopal dignity, with the office which we have in this Council, with the rights appertaining to us as members of the Council, to present petitions. We have already been taught superabundantly by experience, that, so far from such petitions being regarded, they are not thought worthy of an answer. The only thing then left to us, is to express our dissent and protest against this mode of proceeding, which we hold to be most pernicious to the Church and the Holy Apostolic See, that, so far as relates to ourselves, we may thus escape having to give account for the unhappy consequences, which doubtless will shortly arise and are already arising therefrom, both with man and in the aweful judgement of God: whereof be these very letters a lasting memorial."

This 'account,' they say, 'will have to be given by those who do not employ this Council to provide for urgent necessities of the Christian Church, who, overcoming, not the enemies of the Church, but their brethren, and gaining the victory for opinions of the schools, will inflict the gravest injury on the Church: which, considering the circumstances of the Church now, and still more in the future, is matter of continued fear and anguish.'

This inverted order of proceedings was aggravated by the fact that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was not mentioned among the grounds of convening the Council. The Bishops say,

"[5] When first the declaration of Papal infallibility was asked for in a public paper published at Rome, all the enemies of the Church cried out—and the ungodly language spread more and more throughout the world—that the holy Father had convoked the Bishops to Rome under plea of the public good, but, in truth, only to increase his own power, and so out of an unworthy motive; that the grounds given in the Bull of June 19th 1868 for convoking an Œcumenical Council were to be of no account, viz. that a Council should be gathered, that by the counsels of the whole Episcopate, it might be weighed with exactest care, what healthful remedies there might be for the calamities of our times, to promote the glory of God, the salvation of souls, the instruction of Christian youth, the common peace and concord of all."

Another protest of 81 Bishops, against the closing of a debate on the infallibility by a majority was rejected as inadmissible [6].

Another complaint of 62 Bishops, against an unauthorised addition to a Canon, avoiding any separate discussion upon it, was disregarded [7].

Mgr. Darboy contrasted with the Vatican Council, the proceedings of 'the Fathers of the Council of Trent, who passed their decisions in matters of doctrine not by a numerical majority, but a moral unanimity [8].' He says also, '[9] that the Catholic world did not at all wish this question to be settled, nor was there any reason for treating on what has hitherto been freely ventilated among Theologians.'

[4] Docum. &c. ii. 396. [5] Ib. p. 395. [6] Ib. n. 8. pp. 397—599.
[7] Ib. n. 9. pp. 400—403. [8] Ib. p. 420. [9] Ib. p. 416.

THE RULE OF FAITH &c.

---

2 Tim. i. 13, 14.

"*Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.*"

Amid the contradictory voices of these later days, and chiefly since the Judgement of last year (not, God be thanked, by the Church herself) ruled, as far as it had power to rule, that the Church of England had no definite doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, some of you, my younger brethren, have, I know, been perplexed, not, by God's mercy, as to the faith itself, but as to the authority which proposes the faith to us.

I would then turn, although unwillingly, from the thoughts which have most occupied us in this house, if so be, by God's mercy, it may be a comfort to any of you, to state, as clearly as I can, the principles recognized by the English Church as the groundwork and rule of faith. And this the more, because there is not, in these days, one peril only, that some should be disquieted as to

the Church, in which, by God's Providence, they have been placed. There is a yet more subtle peril, by which some elsewhere have been tempted, and others have fallen, the peril of accustoming themselves to take up with a state of uncertainty as to the faith, of doubting impatiently whether there be any one certain faith, and so, but for God's mercy, making shipwreck of the faith altogether.

The source of faith is, beyond doubt, the Holy Scriptures. The language of S. Leo and S. Augustine is the same as that of our Articles. "They," says S. Leo[a], "are not to be accounted Catholics, who do not follow the definitions of the venerable Synod of Nice, or the rules of the holy Council of Chalcedon, inasmuch as it is plain that the holy decrees of both issue from the fountain of the Gospels and Apostles." And when the vision of S. Perpetua, which has since been alleged in proof of Purgatory, was alleged to S. Augustine in proof that Baptism was not needed for the remission of original sin, he answered "that[b] writing is not in that canon of Scriptures, whence testimonies are to be produced in questions of this sort." S. Jerome's words[c] the English Church has embodied in her Articles[d]. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, having rehearsed

[a] Ep. 102 ad Leon. Aug. c. 3.

[b] de Anima et ej. orig. iii. 9.

[c] "As then the Church reads Judith and Tobit and the books of the Maccabees, but does not receive them among Canonical Scriptures, so she may read these two books also [Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach] for the edification of the people, not to confirm the authority of the doctrines of the Church." Præf. in Libb. Solom. T. ix. p. 1295. Ed. Vallars.

[d] Art. VI.

the Creed, says[e]; "for concerning the divine and sacred Mysteries of the Faith, we ought not to deliver even the most casual remark without the Holy Scriptures: nor be drawn aside by mere probabilities and the artifices of argument. Do not then believe me because I tell you these things, unless thou receive from the Holy Scriptures the proof of what is set forth; for this salvation, which is of our faith, is not by ingenious reasonings, but by proof from the Holy Scriptures."

Such is the proceeding of all the great Councils on the Faith; such, of its individual defenders, alike of S. Irenæus[f], Clement of Alexandria or Origen; Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Augustine or S. Optatus; S. Athanasius, S. Hilary or the S. Gregories; S. Basil or S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom or S. Epiphanius or S. Jerome; Theophilus of Alexandria or S. Cyril, or Theodoret. To use the words of one[g], "all things that are delivered to us by the Law, Prophets, and Apostles, we receive, and know, and acknowledge, looking for nothing more than these. For it is impossible we should speak, or so much as think any thing of God, besides those things which are divinely told us by the divine oracles both of the Old and New Testament."

Nor did S. Leo otherwise, in his celebrated tome against Eutyches, which the Council of Chalcedon

[e] Lec. iv. § 17. p. 42. Oxf. Tr. S. Cyril had just said of the Creed: "This seal have thou ever on thy mind; which now by way of summary has been touched on in its heads, and if the Lord grant, shall hereafter be set forth, according to our power, with Scripture-proofs."

[f] See Eirenikon, Vol. i., note A. p. 336.

[g] S. Cyril Alex. de Trin. et Pers. Christ. T. vi. init.

received, and for which, more than all besides, the Church is indebted to him unto the end of time. Supporting it by the testimonies of the fathers before him[h], he himself says of it, "whatsoever[i] was written in it, is proved to have been taken from the authority of the Apostles and Evangelists." The neglect of this he alleges as a ground of heresy: "they[k] fall into this phrenzy, when being, through some obscurity which they meet with, hindered from knowing the truth, they betake themselves, not to the voices of the Prophets, not to the writings of the Apostles, not to the authority of the Gospels, but to themselves; and therefore become manifestly teachers of error, because they became not disciples of the truth."

We acknowledge that Holy Scripture is the source of all saving truth; but it does not therefore follow that every one, unguided, is to draw for himself the truth out of that living well. The Sixth Article lays down the duty of the Church, as the groundwork of every subsequent statement of doctrine. It says nothing of any right or duty of every or any individual to satisfy himself that every article of the Creed can be so proved, much less of any liberty of any one to reject what *he* cannot so prove. It is often the very condition of retaining faith altogether, to continue, even for a long time, to believe without seeing; even if, with all the diligence which a person can use, he cannot see the proof of an article of faith. This, especially with the young, will be

[h] See in Concil. T. iv. p. 1227. ed. Colet.

[i] Ep. 152. ad Julian. Episc.

[k] Ep. ad Flavian. quoted 24. qu. 3. c. 30.

the point of divergence, of which one side will end in a perfect intelligent belief, the other, in total unbelief. Such rejection of one point has ended in atheism. For it was the resistance to the grace of God, and trust in self. The very existence of Creeds, side by side with Holy Scripture,—summaries of its teaching, yet not identical with it; capable of being proved by it, but received before it and independent of it; made ours in Baptism, when we were unconscious; rehearsed in our names, as our belief; taught without doubt or faltering as the truth of God, as much as the Holy Scriptures themselves; inworked into our spirit by devotion; day by day made part of our very being by being spoken to Almighty God as our faith,—shews that we were not meant ourselves to have any choice as to our faith. And this is apart from the very aweful sentences, with which the Athanasian Creed is fenced, that we "hold," *i. e.* retain faithfully, "the Catholic Faith" which we have once received. The very name, "*the* Catholic[1] Faith," "*the* Catholic religion," "*the* Christian verity," by "which we are *compelled* to acknowledge" what is in accordance with it, and "*forbidden* to say" what is contrary to it, shews at once, that in the belief of our Church which has received this Creed, at least the whole doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Person of our Redeemer, as well as the rest of the Apostles' Creed, everlasting rewards and everlasting woe, are to be believed very exactly, without

[1] Athanasian Creed: "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. And the Catholic Faith is this,—Like as we are *compelled* by the Christian verity—so we are *forbidden* by the Catholic religion."

the slightest appeal to our own minds, or any scope for private judgement.

The exhortation[m] in our Baptismal Service, that each of us should be taught, besides the Creed, "all other things which a Christian ought to know and *believe* to his soul's health," shews that, in the mind of our Church, there is beyond the Creed such a body of faith, which it concerns our soul's health to know and believe.

But this being so, has the Church herself any guide external to herself, except the Holy Scripture, as illumined by the light of God's Holy Spirit? S. Paul, not in this place only, has always been understood, from the first, to say that she has.

The word "deposit" became, as we shall see, a word set apart to denote the body of the Christian Faith, committed to the Church; a sacred deposit; to be faithfully guarded, not to be tampered with, not to be lessened, not to be adulterated, but to be kept for Him Who left it to her trust, not to be mingled with any thing foreign from itself. "Keep," Vincentius paraphrases[n], "that which is committed to thee, not that which is invented of thee: that which thou hast received, not that which thou hast devised; a thing not of wit, but of learning: not of private assumption, but of public tradition; a thing brought to thee, not brought forth of thee; wherein thou must not be an author, but a keeper; not a

[m] "And chiefly ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

[n] p. 63. Oxf. Tr.

master, but a disciple; not a leader, but a follower. *Keep the deposit.* Preserve the talent of the Catholic Faith safe and undiminished; that which is committed to thee, let that remain with thee, and that deliver. Thou hast received gold, render then gold; I will not have one thing for another; do not for gold render either shamelessly lead, or craftily brass; I will not the show, but the very nature of gold itself."

S. Paul says first to S. Timothy, "Hold[o] fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me," a form or mould, in which he was to be formed or moulded, and on which he was to frame all his speech upon the faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. S. Paul gave him a sketch, as it were (ὑποτύπωσιν), which he was to follow in all his teaching. "Imitate," Theodoret paraphrases[p], "painters; and, as they, attending to the originals with accuracy, picture to the life their likenesses, so do thou also keep the teaching delivered by me as to faith and hope, as a sort of archetype:" and another[q], "Live and teach, according to that form which thou hast received of me."

A form or sketch of sound words is plainly not only a popular statement of truth, as that "Christ died for us sinners," but the very words in which it was to be conveyed, according to the pattern of which all other doctrinal language was to be formed. Whence it hath been observed[r], how very much of formed statement of doctrine, such as afterwards became the theological language of the Church,

[o] 2 Tim. i. 13. [p] ad loc. [q] Primasius ad loc.
[r] See a very thoughtful article in the British Critic. No. 49.

occurs in the few remains of S. Ignatius, the immediate successor of S. Peter at Antioch[s].

Of this sound "form of words," this definite body of teaching, S. Paul continues, "that good thing which was committed unto thee, the good deposit (*τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην*), keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." "For it is not," says S. Chrysostom[t], "in the power of the human soul, when instructed in things so great, to be sufficient for the keeping of them." And then S. Paul proceeds to speak of the falling away of heretics, Phygellus[u] and Hermogenes. In like way, in his former Epistle, he charged S. Timothy, "Keep[x] the deposit (*παρακαταθήκην*), avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of a falsely-called knowledge;" a boasted knowledge, such as that of the first Gnostic heresies, in opposition to the true knowledge, which S. Paul had, by the grace of God, entrusted to S. Timothy.

This knowledge he so entrusted, not for the time only, or until the Canon of Holy Scripture should be completed, but to be committed to others in perpetual succession. "'The[y] things which thou hast heard of me,' *not*," says S. Chrysostom[z], "which thou hast searched out; heard, not in secret or apart, but 'among many witnesses,' with all openness of speech; 'the same commit thou,' (again *παράθου*) not tell but 'commit,' as a treasure committed is deposited in safety, 'to faithful men,' not to questioners,

[s] Theodoret, Dial. i. p. 49. and Epist. 151. p. 1312. ed. Schulz. Ἰγνάτιος ἐκεῖνος ὁ πολυθρύλλητος, ὁ διὰ τῆς τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου δεξιᾶς τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην δεξάμενος.

[t] ad loc. p. 187. Oxf Tr.

[u] 2 Tim. i. 15.

[x] 1 Tim. vi. 20.

[y] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[z] ad loc. p. 196, 197.

not to reasoners, but to 'faithful,' such as betray not the Gospel they should preach, and not faithful only, but able to convey his doctrine to others, 'who shall be able to teach others also.' " This exhortation follows closely on that mention of the heretics who had departed from the faith, in contrast with whom S. Paul exhorts S. Timothy to "be[a] strong," *i. e.* to persevere "in the grace that is in Christ Jesus."

These two exhortations contain the beginning and the close of S. Paul's commission to Timothy. The first charge was given, when none of Holy Scripture was written. For S. Paul committed these things to S. Timothy when first he associated him in his office, and so before he wrote the 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, the first Epistle which he himself wrote, and almost the first writing of the New Testament (A.D. 54), which is written in Timotheus' name as well as his own. And now S. Paul repeats the charge in the last Epistle which he wrote (A.D. 66), when he had "finished[b] his course, and kept the faith," exhorting S. Timothy to transmit faithfully that deposit of faith, which he "had *heard* of" him.

That 'deposit' of faith, thus witnessed to by the Scriptures, was not the Scriptures themselves. For when first it was committed to S. Timothy, S. Matthew's Gospel alone was written. It was not superseded by the writing of the Scriptures; for when this second charge was given to transmit what he had *heard*, to be again taught to others, all probably had been written, except the writings of S. John. This exhortation also seems framed upon

[a] ἐνδυναμοῦ. 2 Tim. ii. 1. [b] Ib. iv. 7.

that in the Old Testament, by which an unwritten teaching from father to son is commanded, together with the written word. "He [c] established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which He commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children: That they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep His commandments."

S. Paul himself often says, that he was "entrusted [d]" with this teaching by God. To be "put in trust" is his very name for the Apostolate. "Continue in those things which thou hast learned and been *entrusted* [e] with," is his command to S. Timothy. "Sound [f] words" again, "sound teaching" are, in these Epistles, the title for that body of teaching, whether of faith or morals, whereby heresy was to be resisted. The office of S. Timothy was to "keep the deposit;" and to commit it to others who should teach it. To "hold fast," grasp so as not to let it be wrung from them, "the faithful word according to the teaching" (*ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*) is part of the office of the Bishops, whom Titus [g] was to ordain. "*The* teaching," again, is that "mould of teaching, into which," S. Paul says that the Roman converts "had been cast [h];" and

[c] Ps. lxxviii. 5—7.

[d] 1 Cor. ix. 17. Gal. ii. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 4. 1 Tim. i. 11. Tit. i. 3. [e] *ἐπιστώθης*. 2 Tim. iii. 14.

[f] 1 Tim. i. 10; vi. 3. 2 Tim. i. 13; iv. 3. Tit. i. 9. 13; ii. 1. 8.

[g] Tit. i. 9. [h] Rom. vi. 17.

which they obeyed from the heart, transformed and conformed to the mind of Christ which it expressed (*εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*). This again is "the faith[i] once for all delivered to the saints," for which S. Jude bids us to "contend earnestly" (*ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*).

This "body of faith" was complete in itself. As embodied in Holy Scripture by the wonderful Providence of God, ordering occasions upon which, and inspiring the words in which it should be delivered, it is unordered, save through the higher ordering of God, whereby He makes all the varieties of seasons, and conflicting wills of man, all things in nature and in grace, to serve His own end. In the written Scriptures, each word of each Evangelist or Apostle supplies some note of that wondrous harmony which has subdued to itself the wild war of human passions, the dissonance of human wills, the jarring of man's rebellious nature, into a sweet obedience to the Faith of Christ. In the unwritten teaching each Apostle declared the whole counsel of God. The whole Gospel which lies in such wondrous depth in Holy Scripture, was poured forth by each Apostle upon every Church which, by the grace of God, they planted. S. Paul calls the Ephesian Presbyters to witness, "I have[k] not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God." S. Peter says that to those to whom he wrote, "things[l] which the angels desire to look into were reported by those who preached

[i] S. Jude, verse 3.

[k] Acts. xx. 27. "I have kept back nothing which is profitable." ver. 20. "I have shewed you all things." ver. 35.

[l] 1 S. Pet. i. 12.

the Gospel unto them, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." The disciple who had lain in Jesus' Bosom, and thence, where were laid up the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, drank in the torrent of Divine wisdom which he poured forth, says: "That[m] which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; that declare we unto you," the whole mystery which was revealed of God the Word, God of the Substance of the Father in all eternity, for us made Flesh; that they might partake of all whereof the Apostle partook, whose "fellowship[n] was with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." Our Lord said to His Apostles, "He, the Spirit of Truth, shall guide you into all truth." S. John declares that through the same Spirit the whole fulness of the truth had been conveyed to all true Christians. "Ye have[o] an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." They had received the whole truth, and needed not that any man should teach them any thing; for the Spirit within had opened their hearts to receive the whole truth which had been poured forth by the Apostles, and had taught them within, what the Apostles without taught them from, and of, God. "The Anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same Anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him." In like way, S. Jude speaks

[m] 1 S. John i. 1. 3. [n] Ib. i. 3.
[o] Ib. ii. 20.

of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," as one whole, complete in itself. The very words in which S. John speaks, "all who have known *the* truth[p];" "for *the* truth's sake which dwelleth in us;" "whom I love in *the* truth:" or S. Paul, "*the*[q] Gospel," or all, "*the*[r] word of God:" "*the* word of Christ," "*the* word of the truth of the Gospel;" or "*the*[s] faith," "*the* faith which is in Christ Jesus," imply that the revelation so preached was one complete, unchangeable whole.

This was the force of the concurrent authority of the traditional teachings of the Church. The cases in which Apostolic tradition is spoken of as a separate authority, are for the most part comparatively slight. Save indeed that the use of our Lord's words in consecrating the Holy Eucharist is, throughout the world, such a tradition from the Apostles. S. Paul himself says, "the rest will I set in order when I come;" and the order so instituted was held of old to have been transmitted to the Church[t]. In like way, our knowledge, "*which* are the Scriptures," comes to us only through tradition. But for the most part, the tradition, of which so much is said in

[p] 2 S. John 1, 2, 3 S. John 1, Gal. ii. 5, 14, Eph. i. 13, Col. i. 5, 1 Tim. iii. 15, vi. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 15, 18, 25; iii. 8; iv. 4, Tit. iv. 14, Heb. x. 26.

[q] Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25. 1 Cor. iv. 15; ix. 12, 18, &c.

[r] Acts iv. 31; viii. 14; x. 44; xi. 1, 19, &c. 1 Cor. xiv. 36. 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2. Gal. vi. 6. Eph. i. 13. Phil. i. 14. Col. i. 5. 25; iv. 3. 1 Thess. i. 6, 8. 2 Thess. iii. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 9. Heb. xiii. 7. 1 S. Pet. ii. 8.

[s] Eph. iv. 13. Col. i. 23; ii. 7. 1 Tim. i. 19; iii. 9, 13; iv. 1. 6; vi. 10, 21. 2 Tim. iii. 8; iv. 7; Tit. i. 13; ii. 2.

[t] See S. Aug. Ep. 54, ad Januar. c. 6.

the Fathers, is not a supplementary, not an independent source of truth, but a concurrent, interpretative, definitive, and harmonizing witness of one and the same truth. They are not separate truths, apart from Holy Scripture, but the same body of truth which is in it; not to supply any thing wanting to Holy Scripture, but to explain what is in it; not to add to our knowledge, but to prevent our misunderstanding it, or failing to understand the depth of the words which God the Holy Ghost spake. One true sum of teaching of Holy Scripture alone there can be. Discordant voices, as far as they are discordant, cannot be the one voice of truth. One body of truth, and faith, and morals there can alone be, in which every declaration of Holy Scripture would meet, and be combined and fulfilled.

We acknowledge the force of this agreement in human things. If it be a man's saying, the unconcerted agreement of persons, separate in place, but all bearing one conjoined witness as to its meaning, would shut out all doubt as to that meaning. How much more when all the Apostles, guided and inspired by God, the Holy Spirit giving them utterance, forming their thoughts, ruling their words, poured forth, severally in body, but one in the One Spirit of Truth, one and the same full stream of Divine Truth in every Church from Britain to India. Echoes were they all of the One Voice of Divine Wisdom, whose sound went forth into all lands. One and the same light of truth, from One and the Same Sun of Righteousness, illumined at once the whole earth, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. Wonderful was it when in the Day of Pentecost, Parthians

and Medes, and Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Pontus, Asia, Egypt, Libya, Rome, Cretes and Arabians, people of all nations and languages from the three quarters of the world, heard the Apostles speak in their own tongues the wonderful works of God. More wonderful was it when, in every nation, from every nation, from all in every nation, Greek or Barbarian, Roman or Briton, severed in all besides from the whole world, whatever the genius of each, speculative or practical, philosophical or unlettered, but having the word of salvation written without paper and ink by the Spirit in their hearts, there ascended to God one Faith, and one Confession, and one united chorus of prayer and praise, in one and the same voice of truth. The very words of Holy Scripture have absolute authority, and the fuller mystery, and more manifold meanings, and more constraining force, because they are the very words in which each several Apostle was taught to speak his portion of the Divine Truth, in words which were to last for ever. But in these, each Apostle wrote only that part of the whole Divine revelation which God the Holy Ghost, Who distributeth to every man severally as He willeth, gave him. All accord in one, because all spake by One Spirit. Yet God teaches in each something more fully, that no member might be complete without the rest. S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, S. John, S. Paul, S. James, S. Peter, S. Jude make up the one Voice of God. God willed not to give to one even inspired man, the office of declaring for ever the whole mind of God. But although in each several Epistle or discourse, the Apostles delivered that only,

which on that occasion God willed them to deliver to each Church, where each taught, he declared the whole counsel of God, the whole length, and breadth, and depth, and height of the truth of God. And then, when with one accord, on every point of the faith, as heresies arose, there arose also one united cry from end to end of the Universal Church, from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof, "thus have we received; thus have we believed; thus was it delivered to us; thus was it taught from the first:" "it is[u] not now that the faith began, but from the Lord, through the disciples, hath it come down to us;" "these[x] [heretical] dogmas the presbyters before us, who also went up and down with the Apostles, delivered not to you," the united voice of the Church, taught every where by Apostles in whom the Holy Ghost dwelt and spake, was the voice of God.

Weighty as is this concurring voice in itself, its power was much increased by the diligent adherence to the Apostolic rule, "the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The zealous watchfulness over the truth was not simply the spontaneous result of that first deep fervour of Apostolic ages, those ages which, as our Homily[y] says, "were most uncorrupt and pure." It was part of the very office of a Bishop (as it is now) not only to drive away erroneous and strange doctrine, but to "keep that good thing committed

[u] S. Ath. Ep. Encycl. n. 1. p. 111. ed. Ben. Hist. tracts p. 3 O. T.
[x] S. Iren. Fragm. Ep. ad Florin. ap. Eus. H. E. v. 20. p. 540 O. T.
[y] On peril of Idol. Serm. 2. init.

to" them. And so the succession of Bishops from the Apostles was the line of the succession of doctrine also, committed to all, but especially to the Bishops' keeping. "If," says S. Irenæus[z], "the Apostles had known any hidden mysteries which, apart and secretly from the rest, they taught to the perfect, they would, above all, deliver them to those to whom they committed also the Churches themselves. For very perfect and blameless in all things did they wish those to be, whom they left as their successors also, delivering to them their own office of teaching; who, if they discharged their office well, great would be the gain; if they fell, extreme the calamity."

This, then, was the argument of the Church, as each successive heresy arose. We can shew to you, whence our doctrine came down to us: whence was yours? To be new was in itself condemnation, because it could not have come from the Apostles, from whom the old doctrine came. "For us," says Tertullian[a], "it is not lawful to bring in any doctrine of our own choice, as neither is it to choose that which any one hath brought in of his own choice. We have for our authority the Apostles of the Lord, who did not even themselves choose any thing of their own will to bring in, but faithfully delivered over to the nations the religion which they had received from Christ. Wherefore, 'though an angel from heaven' should 'preach any other Gospel,' he would be called by 'us accursed'." "This faith," says S. Irenæus[b], having recited the substance of

[z] iii. 3. 1. p. 206 O. T. [a] de Præscr. c. 6. p. 456. Oxf. Tr.
[b] iii. 4. 2. 3. pp. 209, 210 O. T.

the Creed, "they who without letters believed, are according to our speech, barbarians, but according to their doctrine, their practice, their conversation, are, for their faith's sake, most wise, and please God, having their conversation in all righteousness, and purity, and wisdom. To whom, if any speaking to them in their own tongue were to announce those things which have been *invented over and above* by heretics, they would forthwith stop their ears and flee very far away, not enduring even to hear the blasphemous speech. Thus through that ancient tradition of the Apostles they do not admit even into their thought this monstrous speech. For as yet there was no congregation of these men, nor was their doctrine devised among them. For before Valentinus, they were not who are from Valentinus: nor were they before Marcion who are from Marcion; nor altogether the other pernicious doctrines, which we enumerated above, before the initiators and inventors of their perverseness were." With this argument S. Polycarp, the disciple of S. John, when at Rome, "converted many heretics, preaching," says S. Irenæus[c], "that he had received from the Apostles that one and only truth which was delivered down by the Church."

With this argument S. Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria[d] and Tertullian met the whole swarms of Gnostic heresies: "If[e] it is clear that that is true which was first; that first which was also from the beginning; that from the beginning, which was from the Apostles; it will be equally clear that that was

[c] iii. 3. 4. p. 208 O. T. [d] Strom. vii. 17.
[e] Tert. adv. Marc. iv. 5.

handed down by the Apostles, which was held holy in the Churches of the Apostles." This, Tertullian[f] used against Praxeas, reciting the Apostolic Creed: "That this rule descended from the beginning of the Gospel, even before all those former heretics, much more before Praxeas of yesterday, the posterior date of all the heretics, as well as that of the very novelty of Praxeas, will of itself shew." So when Artemon asserted that the Divinity of our Lord was first taught by Victor, Caius[g] appealed to the Fathers before Victor, "and to all the psalms and hymns of the brethren written from the beginning by faithful men, which hymn as God, Christ, the Word of God."

When Novatian started up and denied the place of repentance, S. Pacian had still the same appeal to the 250 years before him[h].

In like way, against Noetus a Patropassian, S. Hippolytus says: "Let[i] us see what the Holy Scriptures preach, and what they teach let us know; and as the Father willeth to be believed, believe we; and

[f] adv. Prax. c. 2. [g] ap. Eus. v. 28.

[h] Ep. 3. ad Sympron. § 2. p. 336. Oxf. Tr. "Novatian taught this doctrine. But, at least, when did he teach it, brother, or at what period? Immediately after the Passion of the Lord? After the reign of Decius, that is, nearly three hundred years after the Passion of the Lord. And what then did he? Did he follow Prophets, as the Cataphrygians? Some Philumene, as Apelles? or received he himself so great authority? Spake he with tongues? Did he prophesy? Could he raise the dead? For some one of these powers he ought to have had, who was to bring in a Gospel with new laws. Although the Apostle crieth even against this, 'Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.'"

[i] c. 9. in Routh Scriptt. Eccl. Opusc. T. i. p. 64.

as the Son willeth to be glorified, glorify we; and as the Holy Ghost willeth to be given, receive we; not," he adds, "according to our own private choice, nor our own private judgement, not forcing what God hath given, but in what way He willeth to shew through Holy Scripture, so let us see."

The source of faith is Holy Scripture; but to be believed, not according to each one's own mind (*ἴδιον νοῦν, ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν*), but as he says, "let us believe[k] according to the tradition of the Apostles."

Then followed the heresy of Arius. S. Alexander of Alexandria still met it with the same confession, the explanation of the Creed. "These[l] things we teach, these we preach, these, the Apostolic doctrines of the Church, for which also we would die." The Arians he condemns as having "*become*[m] alien from the pious teaching of the Church," "*inventors*[n] of doctrine," "unabashed by the God-loving clearness of the ancient writings," "accounting none of the ancients worthy to be compared with themselves." S. Athanasius uses it as a self-conviction of the Arians. "By[o] writing that 'the Faith is now published,' they shewed that the sentiments of their heresy are young, and were not before. But if they add 'of the Catholic Faith,' they fall, before they know it, into the extravagance of the Phrygians, and say with them, 'To us it was first revealed,' and 'from us dates the Faith of Christians.' And as those inscribe it with the names of Maximilla and

[k] c. 17. p. 75. [l] Ep. Encycl. ap. Theod. 1. 4 ver. fin.

[m] *ἀλλότριοι γενόμενοι τῆς εὐσεβοῦς ἡμῶν διδασκαλίας.* Ib. p. 20. ed. Read. [n] Ib. p. 17.

[o] Conc. Arim. c. i. § 4. p. 78. Oxf. Tr.

Montanus, so do these with 'Constantius, Sovereign,' instead of Christ."

And again, "If[p] they themselves own that they have heard it now for the first time, how can they deny that this heresy is foreign, and not from our fathers? But what is not from our fathers, but has come to light in this day, how can it be but that of which the blessed Paul has foretold, that 'in the latter times some shall depart from the sound faith?'"

And when the several semi-Arian parties in their Councils would impose upon the Church, they still were compelled to acknowledge the same principle of truth, and making partial confessions, true as far as they went, but evading the full truth, they could appeal to the Church that this was the faith which had been taught by tradition from the Fathers. True, though not the full truth. Thus Eusebius, with the exception of the word *ὁμοούσιον*, which he afterwards accepted, brought forth the Nicene Creed as the Creed in which he was baptized. "As[q] we have received from the Bishops who preceded us, and in our first catechisings, and when we received the Holy Laver, and as we have learned from the Divine Scriptures, and as we believed and taught in the Presbytery, and in the Episcopate itself, so believing also at the time present, we report to you our faith." And, again, to overthrow Marcellus, an heretical opponent of his heresy, he pleads, "besides[r] the Divine writings, the Catholic Church of God, from one end

[p] Orat. c. Arian. i. § p. 191.

[q] S. Ath. Nic. Def. App. § 2. p. 59, 60. Oxf. Tr.

[r] Adv. Marc. Anc. l. 1. c. 1 fin. p. 9.

of the earth to the other, seals out of the unwritten tradition the witness from the Divine writings," and "having[s] no novelty to say, nor any ingenious device of my own, but placing before men the uncorrupt teaching of the Church of God, which it guardeth, having received it of old from the beginning, from the eye and ear-witnesses of the Word."

Again, Eunomius, to make way for his heresy, pleads against Antiquity that men should not stop their ears to those who came after, giving the advantage to the body of those who were beforehand. "Great indeed were thy weight," answers S. Basil[t], "if thou by thy command couldest obtain this, which the Devil hath not obtained by his various artifices, that, persuaded by thee, we should judge the tradition which, in the whole past time, prevailed among so many saints, less to be honoured than thy impious invention!" In like way, S. Gregory of Nyssa[u] against their sophistical arguments, whereby they "transmuted the doctrines into this novelty," says, "to prove our word, it sufficeth that we have the tradition come down to us from the Fathers, as our inheritance transmitted in succession from the Apostles through the Saints in order—the teaching of Evangelists and Apostles, and those who in succession shone in the Church."

Again, against the heretics who denied the Equality of God the Holy Ghost, S. Basil alleges the Baptismal formula, appointed by our Lord. He says, "faith[x] is that which is assailed, and the common

[s] de Eccles. Theol. Præf. fin.

[t] Adv. Eun. i. 3. [u] Orat. 3. c. Eun. p. 554.

[x] de Sp. S. c. 10. § 25.

aim of all opponents and enemies of sound doctrine is to shake the solidity of faith in Christ, by levelling and effacing Apostolic tradiction. Wherefore, forsooth as honest debtors, they ask for proofs from what is written, dismissing as worthless the unwritten tradition of the Fathers." And in the Synod where all the heretics of the day, Arians, and Eunomians, and Macedonians were gathered together by Theodosius, if so be they might be harmonised with the Catholic Church, all were baffled by the one question, "whether [y] they would receive those who, before the distractions of the Church, were teachers and interpreters of the Holy Scriptures."

And so the successive heretics, as they arose, were met by this concurrent tradition of the universal Church. This was urged against the Donatists, the Apollinarians, Aerius, Aetius, the Manichees, Jovinian, the Pelagians, Nestorius, Eutyches, by the Council of Arles [z], S. Gregory of Nazianzus [a], S. Epiphanius [b], S. Siricius [c], S. Augustine [d], the Council under Aurelius [e], S. Celestine [f], S. Cyril of Alexandria [g], S. Leo [h].

[y] Sozom. vii. 12.

[z] Epist. Synod. Arel. ad Silv. Conc. i. p. 2249. ed. Colet.

[a] Ep. 102. ad Cledon. ii. vers. fin.

[b] Adv. Hær. 75. § 6. p. 910: Ib. Hær. 76. § i. p. 932: Hær. 77. § 24. p. 1018. [c] Ep. 5. ad divers. Episc.

[d] Against the Manichees, c. Faust. xi. 2. xiii. 2; the Pelagians, de pecc. mer. et rem. i. 24. c. Julian. Pelag. ii. 10. § 34 fin.

[e] Concil. Afric. Univ. A. 418. Can. 2. ap. S. Aug. App. T. x. p. 106. received at once by the whole Church.

[f] Ep. ad Nestor. Conc. Eph. P. i. c. 18. T. iii. p. 906. 910.

[g] Ep. ad Celestin. Ib. c. 14. p. 892, 893. Ep. ad Monach. in S. Symb. T. v. P. 2. p. 175, 176. Adv. Nestor. L. ii. T. vi. p. 30, 31.

[h] Ep. 27. ad Flavian., 69. ad Theodor., 70. ad Pulcher. Ep. 82.

The guardianship of the Faith thus handed down was, according to S. Paul's command, especially committed to the Bishops. But it was not in their possession alone, else it had not been "*the* Faith." Its very force and power was, that it was the possession of the whole people, delivered to them in Baptism, embodied in their prayers and hymns, their inward life, and a part of themselves. It was fenced by Creeds, but was independent of Creeds. The Creed, as settled at Nicæa, had not found its way, after thirty years, into Gaul; but the faith, one and the same, was held throughout the world. "Blessed[i] are ye, and glorious in the Lord," says S. Hilary, "who, retaining in the profession of conscience the perfect and apostolic faith, as yet know not written Creeds. For ye needed not the letter, who abounded in the Spirit. Nor did ye require the office of the hand to write what, because it was believed by you in heart, ye confessed with the mouth unto salvation. Nor needed ye, as Bishops, to recite what, as newborn, when regenerated, ye held. But necessity brought in the custom that the faith should be set forth and subscribed." Hence S. Athanasius could appeal to the people, as a proof of the falsehood of any heresy, "ye knew nothing of this, when baptized." "Who[k] ever heard such things? Where or from whom did the bribed flatterers of heresy hear them? Who, when they were catechized, spake such things to them?" "Before these names were heard of," says S. Hilary[l] to God, "I thus believed

89. et 94. ad Marcian. So also Flavian ap. S. Leon. Ep. 22. p. 755.

[i] de Syn. § 63. p. 1187.

[k] c. Arian. i. § 8. pp. 190, 191 O. T.

[l] de Trin. vi. 21.

in Thee, I thus was new-born by Thee, and thenceforth I thus am Thine." Hence they were startled at any contradiction of the Faith, as being something shockingly new. "Who[m], hearing at his first catechising that God had a Son, and by His own Word made all things, did not so receive it in the sense in which we now mean it? Who, when the odious heresy of the Arians sprang up, was not at once startled, on hearing what they say, as though they uttered strange things?"

Antiquity then was ever the test of truth; novelty, of error. The Church was older than the oldest heresies. What was new was self-condemned, in that, had it been from the Apostles, it would not have been new. "It is manifest," says Clement of Alexandria[n], "that from this first-born and most true Church, those after-born and misshapen heresies and the yet later, were new moulded." "The Holy Spirit," wrote Capreolus[o] to the Council of Ephesus, in behalf of the African Bishops who could not be present in person, "the Holy Spirit will be present with your hearts that, armed with the might of ancient authority, ye drive away these novel doctrines, unheard of before by the ears of the Church." The Council of Ephesus received and echoed[p] his words as their own.

When then the Church decreed any thing at Nicæa, or Constantinople, or Ephesus, or Chalcedon,

[m] S. Ath. c. Arian. 2. § 34. p. 328 O.T.

[n] Strom. viii. 17. p. 325. Sylb. 899. Pott.

[o] Conc. Eph. Act. 1. p. 1075.

[p] "All the Bishops cried out; These are the words of all; these things we all say; this is the wish of all." Ib. p. 1077.

it established nothing new, it did not enlarge the faith, but fixed it. It expressed only in words what had been, from the first, written and graven in the hearts of all. "I call the God of Heaven and earth to witness," says S. Hilary[q], "that, before I had heard either term, I always felt concerning the two words, that by 'one in substance' ought to be understood 'like in substance,' that is, that nothing can be like Him in nature but That which is of the same nature. Regenerated long since, and for a while a Bishop, yet I never heard the Nicene Creed till I was in exile, but Gospels and Apostles intimated to me the meaning of 'one in substance' and 'like in substance.'" The very words adopted were not new, but received words of the Fathers. The words ὁμοούσιον, "of One Substance," and Θεοτόκος, "Mother of God," so far from being newly invented terms, are as old as any terms not in Holy Scripture. "The Bishops," says S. Athanasius[r] of the first, "not inventing the words for themselves, but having the testimony from the Fathers, so wrote." The word Θεοτόκος[s] was received in the time of Origen, and

[q] de Syn. § 91.

[r] Ep. ad Afr. § 6. See early authorities in Tertullian, Note P. p. 506, d. Oxf. Tr.

[s] See in S. Athanasius, c. Arian. iii. 14. p. 420, i. Oxf. Tr., and other authorities, ib. 440, e. 447, s. and x. The following statement of S. Cyril of Alexandria in his letter to S. Celestine, (Conc. Eph. P. 1. c. 14. p. 892—896,) shews how deeply the belief expressed by the word Θεοτόκος was seated, and how near it lay to the hearts of the people. "There was in Constantinople a Bishop named Dorotheus, of the same mind with him [Nestorius], a flatterer for gain, and hasty in speech, as is written, who in the Communion, while the most reverend Nestorius was sitting upon the throne of the Church of Constantinople, rose up and ventured

known even to the yet heathen Constantine. Theodoret, naturally disinclined to it, says, "the[t] heralds of the orthodox faith, of old, and those older than

to say with a loud voice, 'If any says that Mary was Θεοτόκος, let him be anathema.' Then there arose a great cry from the whole people, and there was a running out. For they would no longer communicate with those who so thought. So that now too the laity of Constantinople are without communion (except a few light-minded men, and his own flatterers), and nearly all the monasteries and their Archimandrites, and many of the Senate do not communicate, fearing lest they should be injured in faith, since he and all whom he brought, when he came from Antioch, speak these preverse things. But since, when his (Nestorius) homilies were brought to Egypt, I learnt that *some of the lighter sort* were hurried away, and questioned doubtingly with one another, 'Does he speak rightly? is he in error?' fearing lest the disease should take root in the hearts of the simple, I wrote a circular Epistle to the monasteries in Egypt, confirming them in the right faith.—But your Piety should know this too, that all the Bishops in the East also agree in what I have said, and are pained and grieved, especially the most reverend Bishops in Macedonia. And he [Nestorius] knowing this, thinks that he is wiser than all, and alone knoweth the scope of the Divine Scripture, and the mystery of Christ. And yet how ought he not rather to be convinced, that, when *all the orthodox Bishops and laity throughout the whole world,* confess both that Christ is God, and that the Virgin who bore Him is Θεοτόκος (Mother of God), he who alone denies this is in error! But he is supercilious, and thinketh that by the power of his pen, he will, in his plot against us all, bring us, yea, and all besides, to be of the same mind with him.—As for himself [Nestorius], both our great and admirable and approved fathers, who have said that the holy Virgin is Θεοτόκος [Mother of God] have been anathematised, and we who yet live, with them. And since he liked not to do this with his own mouth, he put up another, the Dorotheus above-mentioned, and set him up to say this, while he himself sat by and heard; and straightway, coming down from his throne, having celebrated the holy mysteries, he communicated him."

[t] Hær. iv. 12.

they, taught to name and believe the Mother of the Lord, Θεοτόκος, according to the Apostolic tradition."

My object has been to set before you as vividly as in this space I could, that there was from the first, a certain deposit of faith, committed to the Church every where, through which she was built upon the Rock which is Christ. So built, every succeeding heresy dashed itself upon her, yet broke her not, but was itself broken and rolled backwards, dissolved in froth, foaming out its own shame. Heresy dashed against heresy; and their conflict was the victory of the Church. This Body of Faith, one and the same every where, in the words of S. Athanasius[u], "the tradition from the first, and teaching and faith of the Catholic Church, the Lord gave, the Apostles preached, the Fathers guarded; on this is the Church founded, and whoso falls from it would neither be, nor be called, a Christian."

This body of Faith is spoken of by different names, from the very earliest times, as a recognized whole, alike by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and his Apologist S. Pamphilus, or Eusebius, as by S. Irenæus and Tertullian. It is called "the Faith of the Church," "the preaching of the Church," "the truth of the Churches," "ecclesiastical teaching," "ecclesiastical faith," "the first and ecclesiastical tradition," "the doctrines of the truth," "ecclesias-

[u] Ep. i. ad Serap. § 28. p. 676. He had just said, "These things which have been said of the Holy Spirit [out of Holy Scripture], alone, by themselves, shew that He hath nothing common or peculiar, in the Nature and Essence, to things created, &c. Still, let us see, in addition to these things, the very tradition," &c.

tical and Apostolical tradition," "Apostolical and ecclesiastical dogmas," "ecclesiastical rule," "the doctrine of the Apostles," "the faith delivered by the Church, fenced by Holy Scripture," "the rule of the heavenly Church of Christ according to the succession from the Apostles," "the celebrated and venerable rule of tradition," "the tradition from the Apostles, preserved in the Churches, through the succession of Presbyters; the unvarying rule of faith received through Baptism," "the tradition of the Apostles," "the Apostolic faith transmitted to us through the Fathers, "that excellent deposit of the Holy Fathers, who were nearest to Christ and the primitive faith," "the word of the Church," "the faith of the Fathers," "the Apostolic rule," "the doctrine heard in Holy Church," "the safe rule," "the rule of the Holy Church of God," "the tradition and rule of truth," "the faith of the Catholic Church," "the rule of truth."

This Divine body of faith, taught by Apostles, confirmed by Holy Scripture, and in turn the expounder of its hard places, was the test of all men's opinions, and itself amenable to none, since it was from God. Such was the principle given in Holy Scripture itself to those under some degree of Divine influence. "Whether prophecy[x], let us prophesy according to the proportion of the faith," *i. e.* so as neither to speak or think any thing beyond the rule of faith. "*The* Faith" was an external rule by which even the words of Prophets were to be measured, a channel within which even prophetic speech was to flow. This body of faith was the mould of the minds

[x] Rom. xii. 6.

of Christians, the treasure of the Church. What she had received, that she was to transmit. She had no reflective office about it. The truth itself was the test of all counterfeits; heresy grew pale in the presence of the faith. Bishops or Presbyters had to "guard[y] the faith of God," and "withal to transmit and preach to their own children what they had received from the holy fathers," *i. e.* the holy Apostles, "to hold[z] fast the faith received from the fathers," "guard[a] the doctrine of the Apostles," "and[b] not to recede from the faith of the Catholic Church," "to hold[c] to that teaching of the Catholic Church, which had been handed down to them from their fathers," "to hold[d] tenaciously the tradition of the Apostles."

The Church, when united in one, brought together her collective traditions, and, over against heresy, declared the ancient faith from the first. She added nothing of her own, but selected at most the ancient term, under which any portion of the ancient faith

[y] S. Epiph. Ancorat. § 119. "Let them cease who are against that holy virgin of Christ and pure bride, our mother, the holy Church. For her sons have received from the holy Fathers, *i. e.* from the holy Apostles, to guard the faith, and at the same time to hand it down and preach it to their children. From whom, most honoured brethren, be ye too sons, and hand down this teaching to your children." Theodoret de cur. Græc. aff. Disp. xi. T. iv. p. 1008 ed. Sch. "Amid these perils, both the Apostles illumined the world, and those after them guarded the faith which they received."

[z] S. Ath. ad Episc. Æg. et Lib. § 8. Hist. tracts p. 134 O. T.

[a] S. Irenæus, iv. 26. 4. p. 386 O. T.

[b] S. Jerome Ep. 119. ad Minerv. et Alex. § 11 fin.

[c] Ep. Syn. Sard. ap. S. Ath. Apol. c. Arian. § 37. T. i. p. 156. Hist. tracts p. 61 O. T.

[d] ἀπρὶξ ἔχεσθαι, S. Ignat. ap. Eus. H. E. iii. 36.

could best be maintained against the new heresies. New *laws* the Church might make; the *faith* she could only declare. The mode of keeping Easter she could regulate; the faith she did not regulate, but attested. "The fathers at Nicæa," says S. Athanasius [e], "wrote concerning the Easter, '*It seemed good* as follows;' for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance; but about the faith they wrote not, 'It seemed good,' but, '*Thus believes* the Catholic Church;' and thereupon they confessed how the faith lay, in order to shew that their own sentiments were not novel, but Apostolical; and what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but is the same as was taught by the Apostles." The Council of Constantinople says [f], "we have uttered brief definitions, ratifying the faith of the fathers at Nicæa." Of the Council of Ephesus, Vincentius says, "they [g] were above all things most careful not to deliver any thing to posterity which they also had not received from their forefathers." The Council of Chalcedon began the consideration of the question of faith by declaring, "No [h] one maketh any other statement of faith [than 'the orthodox Faith, delivered down by the fathers of Nice and Constantinople;'] nor do we take it in hand, nor venture to set it forth. For the fathers have taught; and what they set forth is preserved in writing; we cannot speak other than these things." In their decree they are careful to shew that they set forth no other faith than that of

[e] Conc. Arim. et Seleuc. § 5. p. 80. Oxf. Tr.

[f] Ep. Syn. ad Theod. Conc. T. i. p. 1123.

[g] Common. § 31.

[h] Act. II. init. Conc. T. iv. p. 1206.

the Fathers, that they are "not" even "devising anew aught lacking to the Faith, but considering what is useful for[i] the things newly invented by these" heretics.

On the doctrine of Grace, the belief of the East was as distinct as that of the West. Pelagius obtained his acquittal in the East by anathematizing himself[k]. S. Augustine notices[l] how, by the Providence of God, S. Cyprian and his Council so treated the question of Baptism on the eighth day, as though the Catholic Church were already condemning the Pelagian heretics, who were to arise so long after. In like way it has been noticed[m] how S. Athanasius' language "is as precise as if it had been written after the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies." When the Council under Aurelius condemned Pelagius, it did so, as declaring the belief of the whole Church before it. "The[n] Apostle's words, 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,' are not to be understood in any other way than the Catholic Church, spread everywhere, has ever understood it. For on account of this rule of faith, infants also, who as yet could not commit any sin in themselves, are therefore truly baptized for the remission of sins, that in them by regeneration may be healed, what by generation they derived." The whole Church received[o] and

[i] Allocut. ad Marcian. Ib. p. 1760.

[k] See S. Aug. de gestis Pelag. T. x. p. 191 sqq.

[l] Ep. 166. ad Hieron. de Orig. an. § 24. See S. Cyprian, Ep. 64. p. 195 n. 198 n. [m] Treatises against Arianism, p. 244 n. l.

[n] Conc. Afric. Univ. A. 418. c. 2.

[o] Prosper in lib. respons. ad obj. Gall. ad obj. 8.

affirmed what the African Council truly affirmed in her name.

This very decree of the African Council illustrates the Church's office, to declare the Faith, not as apart from Holy Scripture, but contained in it, as it had ever been understood. She does not propose for faith, ancient traditions, apart from Holy Scripture, nor novel interpretations from Holy Scripture, apart from the ancient understanding of it. She does not, for herself, expound Holy Scripture, but delivers authoritatively that meaning of Holy Scripture which she had received together with the Scriptures, of which, our Article says, "she is the witness and keeper." "My [o] sheep" (S. Gregory of Nazianzus, after his Master, says to the heretics,) "hear my voice, which I heard from the Divine oracles, which I was taught from the Holy Fathers, which I taught alike at all times, not conformed to the times, and will not cease to teach, with which I was born, and with which I will depart." "Our faith is right," says S. Athanasius [p], "proceeding from the Apostolic teaching and tradition of the Fathers, confirmed from the New and Old Testament and the prophets;" and in words from which our Article might be taken: "The [q] holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves for the preaching of the truth." . . . . "Since [r] Divine Scripture is more sufficient than any thing else, I recommend persons who wish to know

[o] Orat. 33. c. 15. . [p] Ep. ad Adelph. § 6. p. 914.

[q] Cont. gent. init., quoted in S. Athanasius, Treatises against Arianism, p. 57. l. Oxf. Tr.

[r] Ad Ep. Æg. § 4. p. 274. ed. Ben. Hist. Tracts, p. 130. Oxf. Translation.

fully concerning these things (the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity) to read the divine oracles." And S. Leo [s], "It is not lawful to depart by a single word from the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles, or to think otherwise of the Divine Scriptures than the Blessed Apostles and our fathers have learnt and taught."

This faith admitted neither of being enlarged nor diminished. It might be stated more fully, as it has been in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. It is itself unchangeable. "Having need," says S. Leo [t], in explanation of his tome, "to discourse against heretics who had troubled many people of Christ, I laid open what we ought to think of the Incarnation of the Word, according to the doctrine of the Gospel and Apostles, and in nothing did I depart from the confession of the Holy Fathers, because there is one true, alone, Catholic Faith, to which nothing can be added, nothing taken from it."

This Faith, then, was not more the faith, after the Councils which fixed its terms, than before. The more evidently, indeed, the faith was set forth, and with the more distinct weight of authority, the more sinful was the self-will of those who rejected it. But the Faith, after these Councils, was only "the Faith," because it was the Faith before. Arius, Pelagius, Nestorius, Eutyches, were recognized as heretics before the Councils which condemned them. They were condemned in their own Churches before the Universal Church condemned them. "So plain," says S. Leo [u], of Eutyches, "is the cause of faith,

[s] Ep. 82. ad Marc. c. 1. [t] Ep. 24. ad Monach. Pal. c. 1.
[u] Ep. 27. ad Theod.

that it had been more reasonable to abstain from summoning a Council."

On these grounds, then, is the celebrated rule of Vincentius founded, which embodies the principles of the English Church[x]. "The Canon of Scripture," he assumes[y], "is perfect, and most abundantly of itself sufficient for all things." But "since the Scripture being of itself so deep and profound, all men do not understand it in one and the same sense, but divers men, diversely, this man and that man, this way and that way, expound and interpret the sayings thereof, so that to one's thinking, so many men, so many opinions almost may be gathered out of them;" "for the avoiding of error, the Prophets and Apostles must be expounded according to the rule of the Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense."

[x] It is said on S. Athanasius against the Arians, ii. 21. p. 364. note b. "John of Antioch furnishes us with a definition of orthodoxy (pietas), which is entirely Anglican." The passage in Facundus, who quotes him (pro defens. 3 Capp. i. 1.) is, "And the most wise John of Antioch with the Council of the East, approved his sound doctrine, in his letters, in which the Council of Chalcedon, above-mentioned, attests that he rejected the accursed sayings of heretics, and declared the Apostolic doctrine. He writes back to the same blessed Proclus, 'I was delighted, not only with the beauty of the composition, or the manifold well-weighed arguments against our opponents on both sides, but still more with the caution and piety as to the sacred doctrines: piety, because you went along the Royal way of *Divine Scripture* in your remarks, rightly confessing the word of Truth, not venturing to declare any thing of *your own ability* without Scripture testimonies; caution, because *together with* Divine Scripture you propounded also *statements of the Fathers* in order to prove what you advanced.'" Bibl. Patr. T. x. p. 4.

[y] Common. c. i. p. 7. Oxf. Tr.

And then he gives his celebrated rule, not his own, but "derived[z] from many excellent, holy, and learned men:" that "we[a] hold that which hath been believed *every where, always, and of all men:* for that is truly and properly *Catholic* (as the very force and nature of the word doth declare) which comprehendeth all things in general after an universal manner; and that shall we do, if we follow *universality, antiquity, consent.* Universality shall we follow thus, if we profess that one faith to be true, which the whole Church throughout the whole world acknowledgeth and confesseth. Antiquity shall we follow, if we depart not any whit from those senses which it is plain that our holy elders and fathers generally held. Consent shall we likewise follow, if in this very antiquity itself, we hold the definitions and opinions of all, or at any rate, almost all, the Priests, and Doctors together."

These then are common principles of the Ancient Church.

1. What is matter of faith must be capable of being proved out of Holy Scripture; yet that, not according to the private sense of individuals, but according to the uniform teaching of the Church.

2. The Faith delivered to the keeping of the Church is one, complete, uniform, whole, capable neither of being increased nor lessened; perfectly delivered to the Apostles by our Lord; perfectly delivered by the Apostles to their successors; perfectly transmitted in succession by them to faithful men after them.

[z] p. 6. [a] p. 8.

3. The Faith was delivered to each Church individually by the Apostle who founded it, and was held and transmitted by it, in harmony with the whole. Each needed not to inquire the faith of the rest, but held it as an hereditary treasure committed to it, to be transmitted by it. The barbarous nations of whom S. Irenæus speaks, in whose hearts the Gospel was written without paper and ink by God the Holy Ghost, held it, as they had received it.

4. The present Church must (if need be), in contradiction to heresy, declare the mind of the ancient Church. Yet what she declares must not be her own mind alone, but according to the teaching of the Fathers. The Church did not assume her own infallibility, but proved the faithfulness with which truth had been transmitted to her. The faith comes to us not on the authority of the present Church, but of the whole Church from Christ until now.

5. The Church of Rome, as the Apostolic Church of the West, had great weight, because, in Tertullian's[b] words, "on it the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood;" in it S. Peter was crucified, and S. Paul beheaded, and S. John endured martyrdom in will. But it was regarded only as one witness to the truth, and especially to the Churches in the West, which were not Apostolic. S. Irenæus refers to Rome in no other way than he does to the Asiatic Churches[c], or any other which had had the Gospel preached to them by Apostles. "We must," he says[d], "not seek truth from others, which we

[b] de Præscr. c. 36. p. 486. Oxf. Tr.

[c] See Note at the end of the Sermon.

[d] iii. 4. 1. p. 209 O. T.

may readily take from the Church, since into it, as into a rich depository, the Apostles poured most fully the whole truth, so that whoever will, may take from it the water of life." Tertullian[e] refers to Corinth, or to all the Churches to whom S. Paul wrote, as he does to Rome. In the third and fourth General Councils (which have been referred to lately[f] for the contrary), the Epistles of S. Celestine and S. Leo are referred to (as Bossuet[g] has shown) in no other way than the writings of S. Cyril; and the most elaborate Epistle of S. Leo, which he rested not on his own authority, but on the testimonies of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers, was received by the Council of Chalcedon, because[h] it

[e] de Præscr. c. 36. p. 485. Oxf. Tr. "Thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very seats of the Apostles, at this very day, preside over their own places; in which their own authentic writings are read, speaking with the voice of each, and making the face of each present to the eye. Is Achaia near to thee? thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, where we also have an authority close at hand." In the Adv. Marc. iv. 5, there is the same stress on the nearness of Italy. "What the Romans, *close at hand*, trumpet forth, to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel, sealed moreover with their own blood."

[f] Mr. Allies' See of S. Peter, p. 78 sqq.

[g] Quoted at length in Mr. Allies' "Church of England cleared from Schism," c. iv. § 1 and 3. Mr. Allies' pamphlet is no answer to his book in behalf of the Church of England.

[h] Conc. Chalc. Act. iv. init. p. 1362—1396. See single instances in "Church of England cleared." &c. p. 283, from Bossuet. To give, as a specimen, any one only from an unknown Bishop, "Lucian, the most reverend Bishop of Ipsus in Phrygia said, 'in

agreed with the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, and the proceedings of Ephesus under S. Cyril.

I may add, a Provincial or National Church was allowed in subordination to the Universal, to pass decrees on matters of faith, which obtained full authority when received by the Universal Church. Arianism was first condemned by a Council at Alexandria [i]; Pelagius, by an African Council [k]; Noetus,

the Epistle of the most blessed and holy Leo, *agreeing* with the Epistle of the most holy Cyril, and the exposition of the 150 holy fathers in the royal City (Council of Constantinople), I concur and subscribe.'" p. 1392. Or the next Bishop more formally, "I, having heard the Epistle of Archbishop Leo, and being fully convinced that it agrees, both with the Epistle of the most blessed Cyril, and the 150, &c., and the 318 holy fathers (of Nice), and assenting, subscribe." Or, one more, "Before the interpretations of our most religious and most blessed father Cyril, and the most blessed Archbishop Leo, we, obeying the exposition of the holy fathers at Nice, so believed, and do believe. But moreover, we agree with the faith of the 150, which clearly sets forth, that our Lord Jesus Christ was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary. This faith of the holy Fathers we so believe, as we here explain, doubting in nothing." p. 1389. Mr. Allies says, "Moreover, the Council subscribes to every particle of S. Leo's letter: the grant of infallibility, deposited in the Church, is not obscurely declared to be seated in the person of her chief." He had given a juster summary before in the words of Bossuet: "So that, indeed, it is evident that, in the Council itself, and before it, their agreement is based on this, that after weighing the matter, they considered, they judged, they were persuaded, that all agreed with the Fathers, and perceived that the common Faith of all and each had been set forth by Leo." [See more fully in Dr. Pusey's second letter to Dr. Newman "Is healthful reunion impossible?" (now entitled "Reunion, as conceived possible before the Vatican Council") pp. 251—268.]

[i] Socr. i. 6. Sozom. i. 15.

[k] Under Aurelius. ap. S. Aug. T. x. App. p. 108.

at Ephesus[l]; Paul of Samosata by a Council of Antioch[m]; Eutyches, at Constantinople[n]; the semi-Pelagians, at the Council of Orange[o].

Nor only so, but Pelagius was condemned against the judgement of the Pope, who thought better of him[p]; and the addition of 'Filioque' to the Nicene Creed, which sprang up in Spain and spread in France, was maintained for some time without the concurrence and against the wish of the Pope[q].

[l] S. Epiph. Hær. 57. § 1.

[m] Eus. H. E. vii. 30.

[n] Acta Conc. Constantinop. A. 448. in Conc. Chalced. Act. i. T. iv. p. 930—1074.

[o] Concil. Araus. ii. See S. Aug. T. x. App. p. 157. Bossuet speaks of the Councils of Orange and Antioch, as having been tacitly received by the Church, "Réponse à plusieurs Lettres de M. Leibnitz," Let. xxii. quoted by Mr. Palmer on the Church, P. iv. c. 7. s. i. T. ii. p. 155.

[p] See the two letters of Pope Zosimus to the African Bishops in behalf of Cælestius and Pelagius in S. Aug. T. x. App. p. 98, 99.

[q] The question was, of course, not as to the doctrine, but as to the insertion of the doctrine into the Creed. S. Leo I. states the doctrine, "qui de utroque processit," incidentally in refuting the Priscillianists (who were Sabellians) in an Epistle to a Spanish Bishop (Ep. 15. ad Turib. c. i.). In the preface of the 2nd Council of Braga, A. D. 563, it is said that a "rule of faith" was drawn up at that time, A. D. 447, by a Synod of Gallicia against the Priscillianists. A rule of faith, stated to have been so drawn up, is still extant (subjoined to the Council of Toledo, A. D. 400, Conc. T. ii. p.1475), in which there occur the words "a Patre, Filioque procedens," but not in the words of S. Leo. It is not specially opposed to the Priscillianist errors.

In the 3rd Council of Toledo (A. D. 589), after the recovery of Spain from Arianism, the "Filioque" appears both in the statement of the faith, the Anathemas against Arianism (Anath. 3), and the Creed of Constantinople. The Council was not aware that it was no part of the original Creed. For after giving the Nicene Creed, they subjoin "The Holy Creed which the 150 fa-

It does seem to be a paradox, then, when some have put forth that the faith is less faith, because not received from a living, infallible authority. Faith is that which rests on Him Who is the Truth, God. Faith is from God, to God. It is not gained by man's own toil, or search, or study, but is given by God. It is one and the same, whether inspired directly from God, as to S. Paul, or taught by His Spirit through the Scriptures, or as S. Irenæus says,

thers of the Council of Constantinople set forth, in harmony with the Nicene Creed" (Conc. T. vi p. 697). The addition crept in unawares into the Creed, as being the habitual expression of their belief. [See more fully in Dr. Pusey's "On the clause 'And the Son'" pp. 35—68].

Pope Leo III., equally believing the doctrine to be essential, objected to its insertion, as unnecessary, on the principle that all true doctrine was not, because true, to be expressed in the Creed. He wished the addition had never been made and that it should be disused; but, on the earnest pleading of the Missi, gradually, for fear of shaking the belief in the doctrine itself (Epist. Zmaragd. ad Carol. M. ap. Baron. A.D. 809. § 54—61). He himself (as is well known) had two massive silver tablets engraven with the original Creed, in Greek and Latin, and placed in the Basilica of S. Peter in witness of his adhering to that Creed. Sent. L. i. dist. xi.

The Creed, however, continued to be sung with the addition. Baronius conjectures (A.D. 447. n. 24) that when Pope Benedict VIII. was persuaded by the Emperor Henry (A.D. 1014) to allow the Creed to be chanted in the Mass, the clause was introduced, that it might be chanted as in the other Western Churches. Elsewhere, he leaves it more uncertain (A.D. 883. n. 34—38).

P. Lombard (Sent. i. Dist. xi.) says, "Since to say that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, is no other than to say that He is from the Father and the Son, the Greeks seem to agree with us in matter of faith, although they differ in words." Mr. Palmer mentions several more both of schoolmen and modern Roman Catholic Divines, and our own, who take

to barbarous tribes, or our unlettered poor, without them. It is one and the same, so that the soul yields itself implicitly to God, receives all implicitly from God, rejects not any thing on its own private caprice or judgement, holds back no part of itself from the light and truth of God. Its life is in love; its fervour through devotion; it is strengthened by works, guarded by humility, kept clear by purity. It cleaves in heart to God, and admits nothing willingly which should separate it from God, or blind it to His Will. "Faith is the evidence of things not seen." How then can that not be faith, which believes the things of God (as we do most surely) with greater certainty than the being of this visible world around us: save as far as that very being is declared to us by God Himself.

Then also as to Him, the Object of Faith. The Church of England has, from the Reformation, held implicitly, in purpose of heart, all which the Ancient Church ever held. The rule of Vincentius was held as explicitly by Cranmer and Ridley and Jewell as by Laud, Hammond, and Beveridge[r]. The Homilies appeal to "God's word[s], the sentences of the Ancient

the same more hopeful view (On the Church, P. 1. c. 9. s. 2), which may the rather be noticed, because some seem now disposed to exaggerate the difference, in order to depreciate the Greek Church.

[r] See Appendix to Oxford translation of Vincentius, p. 103—110. 112. (Ussher, p. 114.) 123. 125. Introd. p. xv.

[s] Against Peril of Idolatry, P. iii. init. "It shall be declared, both by God's Word, and the *sentences* of the ancient Doctors, and judgement of the Primitive Church, &c." Ibid. "Thus it is declared by God's Word, the *sentences* of the Doctors, and the judgement of the Primitive Church, which are most sincere and

Doctors, and *judgement* of the Primitive Church;" they speak of "the[t] *judgement* of the old Doctors and the primitive Church," as explaining the meaning of the "law of God, and acknowledge the six [Œcumenical] Councils[u], which were allowed and received

pure." Ibid. P. i. init. "Contrary to the .... most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the Primitive Church, *which was most pure and uncorrupt*, and contrary to the sentences and judgements, of the *most ancient, learned and godly* doctors of the Church." Ibid. p. 2. init. "This truth .... was believed and taught by the *old holy fathers*, and *most ancient learned doctors*, and received by the old Primitive Church, *which was most uncorrupt and pure*." And again, "To whose (Epiphanius') judgement you have .... all the learned and godly bishops and clerks, yea, and the whole Church of that age [the Nicene], and so upward to our Saviour Christ's time, by the space of about 400 years, consenting and agreeing." Of the place and time of prayer, P. 1. fin. "The which thing both Christ and His Apostles, *with all the rest of the holy fathers*, do sufficiently declare by this." Of Common Prayer and Sacraments. "Thus we are taught, both by the Scriptures and ancient doctors, that, &c."

[t] Against Peril of Idol. P. iii. "That the law of God is likewise to be understood against all our images .... appeareth further by the *judgement* of the old doctors and the primitive Church." Ibid. P. ii. "Let us beseech God that we, being warned by His Holy Word .... and by *the writings* of old godly doctors and ecclesiastical histories, &c."

[u] Against Peril of Idol. P. ii. add Hom. on Fasting, P. 1. "That it [fasting] was used in the Primitive Church, appeareth most evidently by the Chalcedon Council, one of the *four first general Councils*. The fathers assembled there .... decreed in that Council that every person, as well in his private as public fast, should continue all the day without meat and drink, till after the evening prayer. .... This Canon teacheth how fasting was used in the Primitive Church." [A.D. 452]. "Fasting then, by the *decree* of those 630 fathers, *grounding* their determinations in this matter upon the sacred Scriptures."

of all men." On the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, Original Sin and the doctrines of Grace, and the two great Sacraments, she plainly teaches the same doctrine which from the first was always taught.

But it has been asked of late, "Is the act of a Provincial Church which for itself examines Antiquity, any the less an act of a collective private judgement than the same act of individuals?" It is an act of private judgement, in no sense which is not allowed by the Ancient Church herself. The caprice and self-will of innovators, the ἴδιος νοῦς[x], and the ἰδία προαίρεσις, are what are condemned by the Ancient Church, not the reverent investigation of Antiquity, with implicit submission to its authority. Vincentius puts the very case, in which there is no distinct authority of a General Council[y]. "Then shall he diligently take heed that he prefer the universal decrees and determinations of an ancient General Council, if such there be, before the temerity or folly of a few. What if some such case happen, where no such thing can be found? Then shall he labour, by conferring and laying them together amongst themselves, to refer to and consult the Ancient Fathers' opinions, not of all, but of those only which living at divers times, and sundry places, yet continuing in the communion and faith of the one Catholic Church were approved masters and guides to be followed; and whatsoever he perceiveth, not one or two, but all jointly with one consent, plainly, usually, constantly, to have holden, written, and taught; let him know that this without scruple or doubt he ought

[x] See ab. p. 20. [y] c. 3. p. 9. Oxf. Tr.

to believe." And this way, the very Fathers whom we are taught to reverence, themselves practised. S. Athanasius[z] on the word ὁμοούσιος, S. Augustine[a] against the Pelagians, S. Cyril[b] against Nestorius, nay, the very Fathers of the Council of Ephesus[c],

[z] Conc. Arim. et Seleuc. § 43. p. 142. Oxf. Tr.; ad Afr. 6. See Treatises against Arianism, pp. 35, 64 k. Eusebius excuses his acceptance of the term on the same ground. Ep. ap. Socr. i. 8. Ib. p. 64.

[a] Cont. 2 Epp. Pelag. L. iv. contr. Julian. Pelag. L. i. ii.

[b] In defence of the word Θεοτόκος. de recta fide ad regin. Opp. T. vii. P. i. pp. 161—167. ed. P. Pusey.

[c] Act. i. p. 1052—1064. Vincentius (c. penult.) alleges this recent act of the Council of Ephesus in vindication of his principle, and having enumerated the names, says, "All these then are the holy Fathers, agreeing with that sacred number of the Decalogue, who were alleged in the Council of *Ephesus*, as masters, counsellers, witnesses, and judges; whose doctrine the blessed Synod holding, following whose counsel, believing whose testimony, obeying whose judgement, without shunning of labour, without prejudice, without presumption, without favour, gave sentence concerning the rules of faith." "Although a much greater number of our forefathers might have been added, but there was no need. For time was not to be oocupied by a multitude of witnesses, and no one doubts that those ten did not differ from the rest of their Colleagues. After all these we added the sentence of the Blessed Cyril, which is contained in the Ecclesiastical Acts themselves. For when the epistle of the holy Capreolus Bishop of Carthage was read, pressing and beseeching that antiquity should be maintained and novelty cast out, Bishop Cyril thus spoke and defined (which it is not amiss to insert here). For he thus says at the end of the Acts, This Epistle of the most venerable and most religious Bishop of Carthage, Capreolus, which has been read, shall be inserted in the Acts concerning the Faith; whose meaning is plain: for he willeth that the doctrine of the ancient Faith should be confirmed and that modern and superfluous inventions, which have been impiously promulgated should be rejected and condemned.

S. Leo [d] against Eutyches, Theodoret [e], alleged individual testimonies of older Fathers, in proof of the ancient term of faith or the doctrine which they upheld.

"The human mind," says S. Cyril [f], "will correct itself very easily, if having diligently studied the labours of the holy Fathers, those who for correctness and accuracy of teaching have a good report among all men, he shall then examine rightly his own faith. For it is the aim of all right-minded men to follow their doctrine; because they too, having filled their own minds with the tradition of the Apostles and evangelists, and having very rightly and unblameably maintained the word of faith out of the Holy Scriptures, were lights in the world, holding fast the word of life as is written."

Nor is it in truth, so difficult to know what was, or what was not held, as matter of faith, or as Apostolic tradition, by the ancient Fathers. You have seen, in some measure, the undoubting way with which the Fathers speak of matters of faith, as having been handed down from the first. There is nothing conjectural, no wavering, no misgiving. S. Augustine, *e. g.*, against different heresies urges,

On this all the Bishops cried out, 'These are the words of all of us; this we all say; this is the wish of us all.' But what were the words and wishes of all, but that what was delivered of old should be held and that novel inventions should be exploded?" Common. c. penult. Bibl. Max. t. vii. p. 262.

[d] Testimonia Patrum de libb. Catholicorum Patrum à Leone Papa collecta, published in his works after his Ep. 165. ad Leon. Aug. p. 1383, and in some copies of the Council of Chalcedon after his Ep. 28. ad Flavian. (T. iv. p. 1227).

[e] At the close of each of his Three Dialogues. T. iv. ed. Sch.

[f] Adv. Orient. Anath. 8. T. vi. p. 316. Oxon.

"Why[g] submittest thou not thyself to the evangelical authority, so grounded, so established, so glorious, so renowned, and from the Apostles' time to ours, commended by most certain successions, that thou mayest believe and see and learn that those things which offend thee, offend thee from passion and perverse opinion?"

Now to speak very briefly on points as to which our writers protest; it is very clear that throughout the East the Cup has never been denied, nor was it denied in the West for twelve and thirteen hundred years[h]; nor were Indulgences, such as they are now, known for about twelve hundred[i].

[g] Cont. Faust. xxxii. 19. add Serm. 176. § 2. (against the Pelagians,) 172. § 2. [on the N. T. pp. 905, 885 O. T.] de pecc. mer. et rem. i. 26. iii. 2. de nupt. et concup. ii. 51. c. Julian. Pelag. ii. 34. de Bapt. c. Donat. iv. 30.

[h] See Bp. Beveridge on Art. XXX.

[i] Joseph Maria Sanfelicius, a Nuncio, 1659, states the first use of indulgences to have been in A. D. 1096 by Urban II. This, however, itself is only a substitution of joining in the holy wars for "all penance." Conc. Clarom. A. D. 1095. "Whoever out of pure devotion, not for gain of glory or money, shall set forth to Jerusalem to free the Church of God, let that journey be accounted to him for all penance." Sanfelicius distinguishes, in the same way as Chemnitz, 1. the abridgements of Canonical penance, through the intercession of the Confessors; 2. the redeeming or exchange of penances mentioned by Burchard, Ivo, &c. Of this sort was the indulgence of forty days to those who were doing penance for capital crimes by Pope Paschal II. A. D. 1116 (Conc. Lat. iv. p. 1229).

The whole question, as to indulgences, is not as to the right of the Church to relax or change penitential exercises, but as to the direct influence of indulgences on the state of the soul after death, and the ground of that power. Durand (in L. iv. dist. 20. q. 3) Antoninus, Abp. (Summa P. 1. tit. 10. c. 3), Sylvester (Summa

On the doctrine of the intermediate state Roman Catholic writers of reputation say; "No[k] wonder that Ambrose thus wrote of the state of souls; but it might seem almost incredible how, for nearly fourteen hundred years from the very time of the Apostles to the Pontificate of Gregory IX. and the Council of Florence, the Holy Fathers were uncertain and inconsistent. For not only do they differ one from the other, as commonly happens in such questions not yet defined by the Church, but they are not even consistent with themselves, sometimes appearing to grant that those souls enjoy the clear sight of the Divine nature, of which at other times they deprive them." A writer of the twelfth century[1] speaks of Purgatory as the opinion of some.

v. Indulgentiæ), Jacobus Angularis (*i. e.* Hæck) (ap. Joh. Wessel. Opusc. d. 215), admit that Holy Scripture does not speak of them expressly; nor the ancient Fathers and Doctors. Angelus de Clavasio (Summa v. Ind.), that we have no clear testimonies before Gregory; Fischer (Apol. Luth. Confut. Art. 18), that indulgences were discovered rather late (admodum sero) among Christians. They were rested, of old, on a current story about S. Gregory I. and a false account of Leo III., A. D. 803, since abandoned. The first who mentions the "Thesaurus supererogationis perfectorum," is Alexander de Hales, A. D. 1230. The ground on which he rests indulgences, is the authority of the then Church (Summa P. iv. q. 23. art. 1). Berthold, an earnest Franciscan preacher (ob. 1272), speaks of the sale of them as new [see his passage in Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon P. i. p. 201.] De Hales first taught that they applied to those already departed.

[k] Admonit. in lib. de Bono Mortis. T. i. p. 385. ed. Ben.

[1] Otto Frisingensis (A. D. 1146), Chron. l. viii. c. 26. "That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved are either only troubled with darkness, or decocted [decoquantur] with the fire of expiation, *some* do affirm."—Abp. Ussher's translation, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 6. p. 164.

S. Augustine, again, from whom the Latin doctrine of Purgatory is mostly derived, uses the words "it[m] is not incredible," "perchance[n], it is true." And the Greeks are not agreed[o] with the Western Church.

[m] Enchirid. c. 69. p. 128. Oxf. Tr. "That some such thing (tale aliquid) takes place after this life also, is not incredible, and it may be a matter of inquiry, whether it be so or not, and it may either be discovered, or remain hidden, that some [nonnullos] believers through a certain fire of cleansing [ignem quendam purgatorium], in proportion as they have more or less loved perishing goods, are so much the more slowly or speedily saved: not, however such, concerning whom it is said, that they shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven, unless these same crimes be remitted to them, repenting after a suitable manner."

[n] de Civ. Dei, xxi. 26. § 4 (two years before he died). "After the death of this body until we come to that last day of damnation and remuneration which shall be after the resurrection of bodies, if, in this interval of time, the spirits of the departed are said to endure a fire of this sort, which *they* do not feel who had not such ways and pleasures in this bodily life, that their wood, hay, stubble be consumed; but others feel them who took with them such buildings as these; whether there only, or here and there too, or here that they may not there, they may find a fire of temporary tribulation burning up things of this world (although pardonable so as not to incur damnation), I do not refute it, because perchance it is true." In the de octo quæstt. Dulcit. A. D. 420. Qu. 2. § 13. he had used the same words as in the Enchiridion, x. c. 69.

[o] Apol. Gregor. de Purgator. in Council of Florence, quoted by Ussher, p. 166. "A purgatory fire, and a punishment by fire which is temporal, and shall at last have an end, neither have we received from our doctors, neither do we know that the Church of the East doth maintain." They add further: "Neither have we received it from any of our doctors; and moreover, no small fear doth trouble us, lest, by admitting a temporary fire, both penal and purgatory, we should destroy the full consent of the Church." And therefore they conclude very peremptorily, "For these reasons therefore, neither have we hitherto affirmed any such thing, neither will we at all affirm it."

S. Hilary, again, thought only of a fire through which the Blessed Virgin had to pass [p]; and S. Ambrose [q] that S. Peter and S. Paul must be tried by it, though without pain; and prayers for the departed included, at one time, the Blessed Virgin [r], or Patriarchs, Apostles, and Martyrs [s];" and the passage from this life was spoken of as "a haven of rest [t];" whereas the

[p] In Ps. 118 (119) lit. 3. § 12. "Then will a sword pierce through the soul of Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. If that Virgin which could compass God is to come into the severity of the judgement, who shall dare desire to be judged of God?" (quoted more at length "Tracts for the Times," No. 79. p. 36; quoted also by Bellarm. de Purgat. i. 6. in behalf of Purgatory; abandoned, Ib. ii. 1.)

[q] In Ps. 118 (119). Serm 20. § 12, 13. add in Ps. 37 (38.) 14 § 26; of Ezekiel and Daniel (Tract 79, p. 33, 34). Both are alleged by Bellarm. i. 6, withdrawn ii. 1. (see Tract 79, p. 26).

[r] S. Chrysostom Liturg. Græc. ed. α. p. νθ. ed. β. p. μγ. ed. γ p. ξβ. Venet. Goar. p. 78. See Ussher (Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. p. 171. and not. 13). The Ægyptian Liturgies quoted by Ussher (ib. and n. 12) vary. That under the title of S. Basil adds a prayer for the intercession of the saints, whom God is prayed to "remember:" in that given to S. Gregory Naz. the Blessed Virgin, &c. are not mentioned in the text, but in the margin, as being found in another copy.

[s] Constit. Apost. viii. 12. "We offer unto Thee for all the Saints which have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, just men, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Subdeacons, Readers, Singers, Virgins, Widows, Laity, and all whose names Thou knowest." See also S. Basil's Liturgy translated from the Syriac by Masius in Ussher, l. c. n. 10, the Musarabic (ib. n. 17), where after the mention of the name of the chief fathers, the choir responds, "et omnium pausantium," and all who are at rest." (p. 226. ed. Rom. 1755). See further in Ussher.

[t] See note C. on Tertullian, p. 116—120. Oxf. Tr. "on Paradise," and Ussher l. c.

common doctrine of Purgatory is that souls there "never rest[u]."

Again, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin is acknowledged to be of later date. [[v] The graces and endowments of that being cannot be exaggerated, whom Almighty God fore-ordained in all eternity to be Theotokos, Genitrix Dei, the Mother of God. He, in time, created her; He endowed her with all those qualities (and among them of love also) with which it was fitting that *she* should be endowed, in whom "when Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." No one questions or would question the greatness of her gifts, or that her unimaginable love extends to all (as must indeed the love of all according to their degree or capacity).

[u] "We—not yet importunately bereave you of your rest, with crying at your ears at unseasonable times, when ye would (*which we do never*) repose yourselves and take ease." Sir T. More, Supplication of souls, Works, p. 288. And "pains, which else [*i. e.* unless daily masses were purchased] will hold them here with us in fire and torments intolerable, only God knoweth how long." Ib. p. 316. [Another aspect of the intermediate state, that, notwithstanding its sufferings, souls have, even while unadmitted to the sight of God, unspeakable joy—joy beyond all possible joy in this present life, from the certainty of their salvation, from their being confirmed in grace and love, from the impossibility of their ever again, by the very slightest motion of their will, willing anything but the all-holy Will of God, and from the unspeakable love infused into them by God"—(Healthful Reunion as conceived possible before the Vatican Council. p. 107.) this has been a tolerated not an accepted opinion. The treatise of S. Catherine of Genoa, in which she embodied this belief, was apparently almost unknown until a century after her decease. It became known through the praise of S. François de Sales. The *popular* doctrine is still the unmitigated belief of unrelieved suffering. See Eirenicon P. i. p. 98.] [[v] added ed. 3.]

What is excepted against is, not the ascription of any qualities to her, but offices attributed to her, without any authority from Holy Scripture or from tradition which might be supposed to be from the Apostles as given by God the Holy Ghost. There is plainly not the slightest ground in Holy Scripture or Antiquity for what is now taught as if it were faith.] Surely then, when it is taught in authorised books that "it is morally impossible for those who neglect the devotion to the Blessed Virgin to be saved[x]," or

[x] "S. Anselm says, that 'as it is impossible for him who is not devout to Mary, and consequently not protected by her, to be saved, so it is impossible for him who recommends himself to her and is consequently beloved by her, to be lost.' 'Most blessed Virgin, as he who is turned away from thee, and is disregarded by thee, cannot be saved; so he who turns to thee, and is regarded by thee, cannot be lost.' In Depr. li. ad B. V. S. Antonine asserts the same, in nearly the same words; 'As it is impossible for those, from whom Mary turns away the eyes of her mercy, to be saved; so it is necessary that they to whom she turns her eyes, advocating for them, be justified and glorified.' (P. iv. tit. 15. c. 14.) Consequently the clients of Mary will necessarily be saved. Let us pay particular attention to the first part of the opinions of these saints, and let those tremble, who make but little account of, or from carelessness give up their devotion to, this divine Mother, They say that the salvation of those who are not protected by Mary is impossible." [Glories of Mary, c. viii. 1. p. 196.] "Jesus Christ says that no one can find Him unless the Eternal Father first draws him by the means of divine grace. 'No one comes to Me unless My Father draw him.' Thus also does Jesus address His Mother, says Richard of S. Laurence, 'No one comes to Me, unless My Mother first of all draws him by her prayers'" [not found in Richard]. "Jesus was the fruit of Mary: whoever therefore desires the fruit, must go to the tree: whoever desires Jesus must go to Mary." "Mary was this fortunate ship that brought us Jesus Christ from heaven.—Hence Richard of S. Laurence says, 'That in the sea of the world all those will be lost who are not received into this ship; that is to say, all who are not protected by Mary;' and therefore, he adds, 'as often as we see ourselves in danger of

that "it is the Will of God that all graces should

perishing in the midst of the temptations and contending passions of this life, let us have recourse to Mary, and cry out quickly, 'O Lady, help us; save us if thou wilt not see us perish.'" [Gl. of M. v. 2. 141-143.] "Suarez concludes that it is the 'sentiment of the universal Church, that the intercession and prayers of Mary are, above those of all others, not only useful, but also in a certain manner necessary:' '(Sentit . . . ecclesia Virginis intercessionem et orationem præ omnibus aliis sibi esse utilem et necessariam.' T. ii. in 3. part. q. 7. Disp. 23. § 3.) Necessary, in accordance with what we have already said, not with an absolute necessity; for the mediation of Jesus Christ alone is absolutely necessary; but with a moral necessity, for the Church believes with S. Bernard that God has determined that no grace shall be granted otherwise than by the hands of Mary.' [v. 1. ib. p. 136.] "If we wish to find Jesus we must go to Mary." [Bonav. ib. p. 138.] "In vain shall we seek for Jesus, unless we endeavour to find Him with Mary." [ib.] "The way of salvation is open to none, otherwise than through Mary." [Pacciuc. ib. v. 2. p. 143.] "No one is saved but through thee" (speaking of Mary). [ib. some Germanus.] "As a child cannot live without a nurse, so neither canst thou have salvation without our lady: let then thy soul thirst to her, hold her and let her not go until she bless thee." [Bon. in Cant. B. M. V. Glories of Mary, ib. 145.] "The glorious S. Cajetan used to say that we may seek for graces, but we shall never find them without the intercession of Mary." And S. Antonine: "as Pharaoh said to Joseph, 'The land of Egypt is in thy hands;' and addressed all who came to him for food, to Joseph, 'Go to Joseph;' so does God send us to Mary when we seek for grace, 'Go to Mary.'" (Ib. p. 143, 4.) "Richard of S. Laurence says: 'Our salvation is in the hands of Mary;' so that we, Christians, can say to her much more truly than the Egyptians said to Joseph, 'Our salvation is in thy hands.' (ib. Lib. 2. de Laud. Virg. p. i.) The Venerable Raymond Jordano repeats the same thing: 'Our salvation is in her hands.' [ib. De contempl. B.V. in Prol.] "Cassian speaks in still stronger terms. He says absolutely, 'The whole salvation of the world consists in the largeness of the favour of Mary.'" [Ib. Not Cassian's; quoted only from Pelbart. Stell. L. 12. p. 1. a. 3.] "O how many who deserve to be condemned by the justice of the Son does the mercy of the Mother deliver;

pass through her hands[y],” and so, that we “can

for she is God's treasure and the treasurer of His graces,—because our salvation is in her hands and depends upon her.” [Abbot of Celles as quoted by S. Lig. G. M. ix. 1. p. 230.]

[y] “Father Contenson is also of the same opinion: for explaining the words, addressed by our Lord on the Cross to S. John, ‘Behold thy mother,’ he remarks, ‘it is the same as if He had said, As no one can be saved except through My sufferings and death, so no *one will be a partaker of the Blood* then shed, otherwise than through the prayers of My Mother. He alone is a son of My sorrows who has Mary for his Mother. My wounds are the ever-flowing fountains of grace; but their streams will reach no one but by the channel of Mary. In vain will he invoke Me as a Father who has not venerated Mary as a Mother.’” (Theol. Mentis et Cordis. Tom. ii. lib. x. D. iv. c. 1. in Glories of Mary, v. 1. p. 129.) Liguori (l. c. p. 130, 131.) distinctly rejects the opinion of “a certain modern author, who, although in other respects he speaks of true and false devotion with much learning and piety,” says that “the proposition that God grants no grace otherwise than through Mary, is hyperbolical and exaggerated, having dropped from the lips of some saints in the heat of fervour, but that correctly speaking it is only to be understood as meaning that through Mary we received Jesus Christ by Whose merits we obtain all graces. For, he adds, to believe that God can grant us no graces without the intercession of Mary would be contrary to faith and the doctrine of S. Paul, who says that we acknowledge but one God and one Mediator of God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.” (1 Tim. ii. 5.) He explains the mediation of Mary to be “a mediation of grace by way of prayer;” excepts against the words “God *can* not grant graces without the intercession of Mary,” but allows that “He *will* not.” “It is one thing to say that God *can* not, and another that He *will* not grant graces, without the intercession of Mary;” and adds, “We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of justice, and that by His merits, He obtains for us all grace and salvation; but we say that Mary is the mediatress of grace, and that receiving all she obtains, through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet all the same whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession.” “From the moment

only hope to obtain perseverance through her[z];" that "God granted all the pardons in the Old Testament absolutely for the reverence and love of this

that this Virgin Mother conceived the Divine Word, she acquired a special jurisdiction, so to say, over all the gifts of the Holy Ghost: so that no creature has since received any grace from God, otherwise than by the hands of Mary." (Bernardin. Sen. Serm. 61, Tr. 1, Art. 8, quoted ib. v. 1. p. 135.) "For this reason all gifts, all virtues, and all graces of that same Holy Spirit are dispensed through her hands to whom she wills, when she wills, how she wills, and as much as she wills." (Ib. 136.) "An ancient author, probably S. Sophronius, in a sermon on the Assumption, published with the works of S. Jerome, says that 'the fulness of all grace which is in Christ as in the Head inflowing, came into Mary though in a different way'" [does not occur]. "The same idea is also confirmed by S. Bernardine of Sienna, who explains it more clearly, saying, that through the Virgin are transfused from Christ their Head all the vital graces into His mystical body." (Glories of Mary, v. 1. pp. 134, 5.) "Mary is called the co-operatrix of our justification, because God has entrusted to her all the graces which He will dispense to us." [Ib. v. 2. p. 141.] "The throne of grace (Hebr. iv. 16) is the B. V. Mary." (Alb. M. de dedic. Eccl. Serm. liii. G. M. p. 352.) "If then we wish for graces, let us go to the throne of grace which is Mary." [Ib.]

[z] "If it is true (and I hold it as certain according to the now generally received opinion and which I shall prove in the fourth chapter of this work), that all the graces which God dispenses to men pass by the hands of Mary, it will be equally true that it is only through Mary that we can hope for the greatest of all graces—perseverance. And we shall obtain it most certainly, if we always seek it with confidence through Mary. This grace she herself promises to all who serve her faithfully during life, 'They who work by me shall not sin; they that explain me shall have everlasting life.'" [Gl. of M. ii. 2. p. 62.]

"S. Francis Borgia always doubted the perseverance of those in whom he did not find particular devotion to the Blessed Virgin." [Ib. p. 64.] "S. Philip Neri in his exhortations to his penitents used always to say 'My children, if you desire perseverance, be devout to our Blessed Lady." [Ib. p. 66.] "'If this dissolute youth

Blessed Virgin[a];" God has constituted Mary the ordinary dispensatrix of His grace[b]; "he who ne-

[the prodigal son] had had a mother living, he would never have abandoned the paternal roof, or, at least, would have returned much sooner than he did;' meaning, thereby, that a son of Mary either never abandons God, or, if he has this misfortune, by her help, he soon returns. Oh, did all men but love this most benign and loving lady, and had they but recourse to her always and without delay in their temptations, who would fall? Who would ever be lost? He falls and is lost who has not recourse to Mary." [ib. 67.]

"God recommended her own goats to Mary, i. e. those who, although contaminated by wickednesses, serve and honour Mary;" [Gul. Angel. in Gl. M. vi. 3. p. 178.]

"Thou art the only hope of sinners," a sermon by an ancient writer found in the works of S. Augustine, de annunc. B. V. M. [in Gl. Mary iii. 2. p. 95.] [The words and context are not in MSS. of the Sermon, which the Benedictines say is "the work of some unskilful patchwork-maker."]

"Open to us, O Mary, the gates of paradise, since thou hast its keys." (spurious, quoted as S. Ambrose, ib. viii. 3. p. 213.) "Who is saved? who reigns in heaven? They for whom the Queen of mercy intercedes." (Denys. Carthus. [not found.] Ib. p. 214.) "He who serves Mary, is as secure of Paradise, as if he were in Paradise." (Abb. Guerric. [not found] ib. p. 215.) "Whoever honours our Blessed Lady has a very great sign of predestination." Bl. Alan. [de Psalt. p. 2. c. 11. ib. 218.] "Be it a most probable sign of eternal salvation, if thou perseveringly in the day salute the Blessed Virgin in the Psalter." (ib. pp. 218, 219.)

[a] Bernard. Sen. Serm. 61. Art. 1. c. 2. fin. p. 512. ed. Ven. 1591. [Serm. v. de Nat. B. V. c. 2 fin. T. iv. p. 91. col. l. Ven. 1745.]

[b] "Thy office is to interpose thee as intervening [mediam] between God and man." William of Paris. [Gl. M. vi. 2. p. 171.] Whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession." [Gl. M. v. 1. p. 131.] The way of salvation is open to no one otherwise than through Mary." [Pacciuc. de B. V. Gl. M. v. 2. p. 143.]

"Mary is the most faithful mediatrix of our salvation." [Bonav. v. 1. p. 128.] "Thou art the dispenser of all graces; our salvation depends on thee." [Bernardin. Sen. Serm. i. de Nat. B. V. Gl. of M. v. 2. p. 144.] "Whatsoever good God giveth to His creatures, He

glects Mary shall die in his sins[c]; that it is safer "to go to the Blessed Virgin, than to our Lord[d];" or that "Mary so loved the world, that she gave her only-

willeth to pass through the hands of the Virgin Mother." (Richard S. Laurence Gl. M. v. 1. p. 136.) "Thou, O Mary, art the Propitiatory of the whole world. From thee does our most compassionate Lord speak to our hearts, from thee He speaks words of pardon and mercy: from thee He bestows His gifts: from thee all good flows to us." (Pacciuc. in Glor. of Mary, iii. 1. p. 85.) "All our eyes ought always to look to the hands of Mary, that through her hands we may receive some good." (Bonav. Lect. iii. Spec. ib. p. 88. See further Ussher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 9. p. 415—429.)

[c] Bonav. Ps. M. Ps. cxvi. Opp. vi. 487. "Who calleth not on thee in this life, shall not come to the kingdom of God." Ib. p. 485. Ps. lxxxvi. "From whom thou turnest away thy face, there shall be no hope of salvation." Ib. p. 486. Ps. xcix. "It is impossible that any sinner can be saved, save through thy help and favour, O Virgin. For whom the justice of God saves not, Mary saves by her intercession, by infinite mercy." (Spurious, but ascribed to S. Chrysostom, if not S. Ignatius; marked as not found Gl. M. viii. 1. ib. pp. 196, 197.) "The nation and kingdom which shall not serve thee shall perish." [Bibl. Mar. in Is. n. 20. Gl. M. ib. p. 196.] "Those [gens] who do not serve Mary will not be saved: for those who are deprived of the help of this great Mother are also deprived of the help of her Son and the whole court of heaven," [ascribed wrongly to Damascene]. Glo. M. viii. 3. p. 215 [marked as not found]. "However great a sinner any may have been, if he was devout to Mary he shall never perish." (Spurious, but given to S. Hilary, Can. xii. in S. Matt. Glories of Mary, viii. 1. p. 198.)

"[d] In the Franciscan chronicles it is related that brother Leo once saw a red ladder, on the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and a white one on the top of which was His most holy Mother: and he saw some who tried to ascend the red ladder, and they mounted a few steps, and fell—they tried again, and again fell. They were then advised to go and try the white ladder, and by that one they easily ascended, for our Blessed Lady stretched out her hand and helped them, and so they got safely to heaven." (Gl. of M. viii. 3. p. 213.) Speculum Vitæ Francisci et sociorum ejus, part ii. cap.

begotten Son[e];" surely we may ask with S. Athanasius, "Whence or from whom did they learn this? who of the Fathers taught it?" Were this so, how is it that Holy Scripture speaks of the Throne of our Lord only, as "the Throne of grace;" how that it so inculcates on us only that He is "the one Mediator between God and man;" and speaks of no one with Him? or how that none of the Apostles delivered this teaching to those after them, or for so many hundred years, the Church knew nothing of it?

Yet this doctrine is methodised, so as to bear very closely upon the Intercessorial office of our Lord Himself. It is said in the name of the Church[f],

45, edit. Gulielmi Spoelberch. Item, Speculum Exemplorum, Dist. vii. Exempl. xli. in Ussher Ans. to Jesuit c. ix. p. 429.

[e] S. Bonaventura in Gl. M. on Mary's charity towards her neighbours p. 478.

[f] I would not have given a passage of this sort except from an acknowledged writer. It is from the "Catéchisme Chrétien pour la vie intérieure," by the celebrated M. Olier, Founder of the Seminary of Sulpice, whose life has been published. The Catechism was republished, Paris, 1831, with the original approbations by François, Bishop of Pamiers, 1656, and Henri, Bishop of Puy and Count de Velay, 1655, prefixed.

M. Olier continues to contrast "the Sacrament of Mary" with the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, as one of mere mercy. "Have you not often heard those words of S. Paul: 'Whoso eateth and drinketh unworthily [the Body and Blood of the Lord], eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.' JESUS CHRIST is, in the Holy Sacrament, risen again and full of glory; and though He be in a Sacrament of goodness and mercy, He nevertheless therein exercises His judgements very commonly by condemnations. We must then go to a Sacrament which is solely of mercy, and wherein Jesus Christ exercises no judgement. This Sacrament is the most Blessed Virgin. It is through her that we have access to Jesus Christ in full confidence. If our heretics had thus understood the prayer of the saints, they would never have dared to condemn it."

"the intention of the Church is that we seek Jesus Christ in His Saints, and we are much more sure of finding Him in His Saints, for instance in the Blessed Virgin, S. Joseph, S. John, S. Peter, than when we seek Him immediately and of ourselves . . . We are very unworthy to draw near unto Jesus, and He has a right to repulse us [rebuter] because of His Justice, since, having entered into all the feelings of His Father from the time of His Blessed Resurrection, He finds Himself in the same disposition with the Father towards sinners, *i. e.* to reject them; so that the difficulty is to induce Him to exchange the office of Judge for that of Advocate, and of a Judge to make Him a Suppliant: now this is what the Saints effect, and especially the Most Blessed Virgin."

Again, the Church of England may ask; Since no one text of Holy Scripture can be alleged for the invocation of saints, since it is said of our Lord that "He ever liveth to make intercession for us," that "we have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities;" that we may "come boldly to the throne of grace;" that there is but One Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus; on what authority is this teaching delivered in the name of the Church?

I have now, as I was able in this space, set before you as in a sketch, the principles upon which the Church of England claimed to act in the Reformation, principles maintained by the body of Primitive teachers. But far more is required, in these troubled days, than any intellectual statements to keep the mind in a calm state, so as to hear the voice of truth.

"For studying and mastering the Scriptures," says S. Athanasius [e], "there is need of a good life and a pure soul, and virtue according to Christ." Our Lord Himself has laid down this rule: "If any man will do His Will, he shall know of the doctrine."

"In patience possess ye your souls." "God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble." "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God." In patient waiting upon God, not in (what your elders hear of with sorrow) fretful complaining of the rulers of the Church: in humility in learning, not in hasty and often false judgements of the formularies of the Church, through which God has taught you, and from which you have yet to learn: in devout use of her prayers, not in criticisms of what holy souls have found a deepening treasure; in thankful use of God's mercies and means of grace, not in exaggerations of our own evils and ideal pictures of the good elsewhere; in repentance for having used God's gifts so little, not in contemptuous and hard speeches; in humility, in purity, in patience, in love unfeigned, shall ye possess and have the mastery of your own souls, submitting and commending them to Him, Whose they are.

These are heavy times. Darkly did the last year close; darker has the present begun. We seem to have fallen on the times of the prophet, who cried, "O Lord [f], how long shall I cry, and Thou wilt not hear? cry out unto Thee of violence, and Thou wilt not save? Strife ariseth, contention lifteth itself up."

Contention has taken the place of love; suspicion,

[e] de Incarn. § 7. ult. p. 95. [f] Hab. i. 2, 3.

of trust; outcry against man, of prayer to God; belief of any evil, of "hoping all things;" impatience of one another, of "enduring all things." The very desire to understand one another (would that it may not be true!), the very desire to love one another, seems well nigh gone amid this ceaseless strife. And while the shepherds are at variance, "the wolf cometh and scattereth the sheep." And where is the end thereof? One only hope we have, that the love of God will cover and overrule the unlove of man.

We all desire to know and to teach *the* Faith; we all believe that we have it; I do trust that, if we could understand one another, we might meet in the one truth. Bnt this cannot be the sound and healthy and normal state of a Church, which we have been wont thankfully to call pure and Apostolic, that we should be contradicting one another, condemning one another: this is not like the time of Apostles, when all were of one heart and of one mind; this is not to fulfil the Apostolic precept, "let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body," when some are ready to cast others out of that body. Indifference to *the* truth were a worse evil still; agreement to regard doctrines of the faith once delivered to the saints, as "open questions," would be to declare them no matters of faith at all. "There is," the Apostle says, "One Faith, One Baptism," as well as "One Lord and One God." Why, instead of this endless strife, casting out one another, will we not seek one another, be at pains to understand one another, harmonize what all believe truly, not

by abandoning any truth, but by affirming together all which is the truth?

All own that things ought not to be thus. Yet "what evil is there in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" What are all evils, but God's merciful chastisement of accumulated sins?

Blessed days of penitence are coming upon us. Would that we could use these, at least to humble ourselves for our own share of the common sin! It cannot be well-pleasing to Him, that we, disciples of One Lord, members of one body, baptized into one Faith, heirs of one hope, debtors to one another to "love one another, as He has loved us," should be at strife, how we should worship Him; at strife, how we become members of Him; at strife, how we should believe His Presence among us; at strife, even about a very remedy for our sins, and how to seek His pardon. If we can neither bear our evils, nor their remedy, at least we can spread our miseries before Him, and ask Him to "spare His people, whom He hath redeemed with His most Precious Blood."

The cry of the Church is the pledge of her deliverance. When after four hundred years of bondage, Israel cried by reason of her taskmasters, "God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God had respect unto them."

It is not despondency, it is the very ground of hope to cry "Lord, we trust *alone* in Thee." It is not because our Lord is not in the boat of the Church, but in the belief that He is, that His disciples cry,

"Lord, save us, we perish." It is because "we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have told us the noble works which God did in their days, and in the old time before them," that we say, "O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for Thine honour." "It is Thou that savest us from our enemies," we said unto Him this morning, and on that very ground we ended;

"Up, Lord, why sleepest Thou? Awake, and be not absent from us for ever. Wherefore hidest Thou Thy Face, and forgettest our misery and trouble? For our soul is brought low, even unto the dust; our belly cleaveth unto the ground. Arise, and help us: deliver us for Thy mercy's sake." Amen.

NOTE on p. 37.

The passage cited is S. Irenæus' conclusion. He begins by laying down (c. 1 [pp. 204 sqq. O.T.].) that our only knowledge of the dispensation of our salvation was from the Apostles, first teaching, then writing; that when they preached, they had perfect knowledge, being filled with the Holy Ghost. The heretics, however, appealed from Scripture to tradition; but when the Church "challenges them to that Tradition which is from the Apostles, which, by succession of Presbyters is guarded in the Churches, they oppose Tradition" also, blaming the Apostles themselves.

S. Irenæus then begins (c. 3.) to set forth the argument from the concurrent tradition of the Church. "The tradition, then, of the Apostles made manifest in the whole world, all who wish to see the truth, may see *in every Church;* and we are able to recount those who were instituted by the Apostles as Bishops in the Churches, and their successors, down to us, who taught or knew nothing of what these men rave of." (Then follows the passage as to *all* Bishops, quoted p. 17.) 2. "But since it were very long in this space, to enumerate the successions of all Churches, we will, by setting forth the Tradition and the Faith preached to men, which that very great and ancient Church, well known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, hath from the Apostles, coming down even to us by succession of Bishops, put to shame all those who in any way, either by self-pleasing, or vain glory, or blindness and evil mind, make unlawful conventicles. For with this Church, on account of its higher original[a],

[a] Such is undoubtedly the meaning of principalitas, ἀρχή, in S. Iren. i. 31. 1. "Others [heretics] again name Cain, 'a superiore principalitate' from his higher (earlier) original," and ii. 1, 2, "ab altera principalitate' from another origin, or principle." In like way "principalis" stands for ἀρχαῖος, v. 14. 1. "Unless He Himself had been made flesh and blood according to the original (principalem) formation, saving in Himself, in the end, what had perished in the beginning (principio) in Adam." "Principalis plasmatio" is evidently the same as "prima plasmatio" (n. 2.), and is chosen probably to correspond with "principium." And again, v. 21. 1. "The Lord confesseth Himself to be the Son of Man, that primæval man "principalem hominem." This sense agrees with what

every Church, *i. e.* the faithful who are on all sides [all around] must needs[b] agree, in which the Tradition from the Apostles has always been preserved by those who are on all sides."

In giving the earlier links of this succession, S. Irenæus especially dwells on the means which those Bishops had of knowing the mind of the Apostles; thereby the more shewing that his object in thus citing the tradition of the Church at Rome was the full evidence that it was the teaching of the Apostles.

"The blessed Apostles, then having founded and built up this Church, committed the ministry of the Episcopate to Linus. *Of this Linus, Paul* makes mention in the Epistle to Timothy. Anacletus succeeds him. After him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement obtained the Episcopate, who had both *seen the blessed Apostles*, and *been with them*, and *still had the preaching of the Apostles ringing in his ears*, and their tradition before his eyes; and that not alone; for there were then yet many left, who had been taught by the Apostles. In the time of this Clement, no slight dissension having arisen among the brethren at Corinth, the Church at Rome sent a most satisfactory[c] letter to the Corinthians,

S. Irenæus says before of the antiquity of the Roman Church (antiquissim.), and 3, 4. 1. "ought we not to have recourse to the oldest (antiquissimas) Churches?" This is the relation which it bore to the other Western Churches, the faithful on every side of it (undique, not ubique), and these had their share (probably by comparing their traditions) in preserving the genuine tradition. For this seems to be the only meaning admitted by the words, "*in which* (Church) that tradition which is from the Apostles, has always *been preserved by* those on all sides." The mutual comparison of the traditions, (as in a Council,) strengthens and corrects each. The passage of Tertullian is (as often elsewhere) a Comment on S. Irenæus.

[b] Gieseler (Kg. i. 2. § 50. p. 176) observes that the word, "necesse est" would be a translation of ἀνάγκη not δεῖ, a necessity in the nature of things, not a moral obligation. Since the Roman Church had a higher original than the rest of the West, being so Apostolic, it must needs (then, when S. Irenæus was speaking,) represent the faith of all, in the nature of things all must agree with it. Massuet, Diss. Præv. ad Iren. (iii. 4. § 31, p. cxx.) accepts the interpretation of "ad hanc Ecclesiam—necesse est convenire," *i. e.*, that it is a translation of *συμβαίνειν πρὸς*, "agree with." Gieseler supposes the Greek to have been, *πρὸς ταύτην γὰρ ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τὴν ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχὴν ἀνάγκη πᾶσαν συμβαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τοῦτ' ἐστι τοὺς πανταχόθεν πιστοὺς, ἐν ᾗ ἀεὶ τοῖς πανταχόθεν συντετήρηται ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων παράδοσις.* S. Irenæus is not laying down an abstract proposition of any inherent authority of Rome, but what was actually, in the nature of things, true then.

[c] *ἱκανωτάτην*, "most admirably suited to its end." S. Irenæus uses the same word immediately afterwards of the Epistle of S. Polycarp. This is noticed, because an undue stress has been laid lately upon the word, on account perhaps of the Latin translation "potentissimas."

reconciling them, and renewing their faith and the tradition which it had recently received from the Apostles, preaching one God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth.—That this Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is preached by the Churches, they who will, may learn from the letter itself, and understand the Apostolic tradition of the Church, since the Epistle is older than those who now teach falsely."

Then having enumerated the Bishops at Rome until the 12th, the then Bishop, he sums up this part, "In this same order, and the same succession, both the tradition from the Apostles in the Church, and the preaching of the truth reached us."

S. Irenæus then goes on in the same way to speak of the tradition of S. Polycarp. "And Polycarp too, not only *having been instructed by the Apostles*, and having lived continually with many who had seen Christ, and having also been appointed by Apostles Bishop in Asia, in the Church at Smyrna, whom we too saw in our earliest youth (for he continued long, and when very aged, departed out of life having borne in martyrdom a glorious and most illustrious testimony), uniformly taught these things, which he had also learned from the Apostles, which also the Church hands down, which also alone are true. *To these things all the Churches in Asia bear witness*, and they who until now have *succeeded Polycarp*, who was a much more credible and surer witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion, and the rest of the ill-minded." Then, having mentioned his converting heretics at Rome by his testimony to the Apostolic teaching (see above, p. 18, p. 218 O.T.), and his dealing with Cerinthus and Marcion, he adds, "there is also a most satisfactory letter of Polycarp, written to the Philippians, from which they who desire and have a care of their own salvation may learn the character of his faith, and his preaching of the truth."

"Moreover the Church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, John also having continued with them until the time of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles." Upon this follows the passage in the text, "The proofs then being so great, we ought not," &c. He continues, "For this is the entrance of life; all the rest are thieves and robbers. Wherefore, we ought to avoid them, and with the greatest diligence choose what is of the Church, and lay hold of the tradition of truth. For what? If the discussion were concerning some slight question, ought we not to have recourse to the oldest Churches, in which the Apostles lived, and take from them, as to

the question in hand, what is clear and certain? For what if the Apostles had not left us Scriptures, must we not follow the order of Tradition, which they delivered to those to whom they committed the Churches?

"With which ordinance many nations of those Barbarians who believe in Christ agree, having, without paper and ink, salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, and diligently keeping the ancient tradition, believing in the One God, Maker of Heaven and earth and all that is in them, through Christ Jesus, the Son of God; Who, for His most exceeding love for His creature, underwent that birth of the Virgin, Himself, through Himself, uniting man to God; Who suffered under Pontius Pilate, rose again, was received up into glory, and in glory shall come, the Saviour of those who are saved, and Judge of those who are judged, and casting into everlasting fire the distorters of the truth, and despisers of His Father and of His Coming" (upon which follows the passage quoted above, p. 17).

These very Barbarians had their own tradition of doctrine from the Apostles; they, equally with Rome, Smyrna, Ephesus (of whom S. Irenæus had spoken), were, in his mind, secured from heresy, not by intercourse with Rome, but "by that ancient Tradition of the Apostles."

THE END.

PRINTED BY THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY OF THE HOLY TRINITY,
HOLY ROOD, OXFORD.

ALL FAITH THE GIFT OF GOD.

REAL FAITH ENTIRE.

TWO SERMONS,

PREACHED

BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

ON

THE TWENTY-THIRD AND TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAYS AFTER TRINITY, 1855.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

THIRD THOUSAND.

SOLD BY

JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER, OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON,

AND HIGH STREET, OXFORD.

MDCCCLXIV.

PLYMOUTH:
PRINTED AT THE PRINTING-PRESS OF THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY.
1864.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

PAGE

Not justifying faith only, but every beginning of or tendency to faith, the gift of God. . 1
Order of God's Grace towards one wholly a stranger to Grace. . . . . Ib.
Condition of the baptized . . . 2
Faith, being the gift of God, strengthened or recovered by the Grace of God . . 4
Correspondence between human and Divine faith . 5
They differ, in that Divine Faith is inwrought by God 6
Angels and men cleave to God by the Grace of God 7
All, even the beginnings of Grace, in us, from God, but with our own consent, . . . 8
Scripture proof. Eph. ii. 5. Phil. i. 20. . . Ib.
1 Cor. vii. 25. 1 Pet. ii. 10. Rom. xi. 30. 31. ix. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 10. 9
1 Cor. iv. 7. 10
2 Cor. iii. 5. Phil. ii. 13. . . . 11
Is. lxv. 7. 12
S. John vi. 44. 13
Summary in the second Council of Orange . 14
Art. x. on Free will 15
Revelation not addressed to reason only . . 16
Reason before, and after the Fall . . Ib.
The Fall corrupted both body and soul of man . 17
Spiritual sins blind more fatally than even carnal . Ib.

PAGE
Temptations of high intellect . . . 18
Attitude of natural intellect towards God . . 19
Unsanctified intellect in most special antagonism to God 21
Intellect, like all other gifts, perfected through trial 23
Unenlightened intellect is blind in Divine things . 24
The creature knows God, only through Revelation of God 25
Man can only receive the Revelation of God through the Grace of God . . . . Ib.
S. Matt. xi. 25. Is. vi. 9. 10. . . . 26
Natural wisdom, the way to understand natural things; Grace, the way to receive Divine . 27
The intellect, held captive by the will; freed, not in itself, but by setting free the will . . Ib.
1 Cor. i. 19 sqq. 28
Hostility to belief, changed in form, unchanged in substance 30
Deepest grounds of faith often difficult to produce . 31
Intuitive 32
Might and serenity of faith . . . Ib.
Certain knowledge of faith . . . 33
What injures Grace, injures faith . . Ib.
Trials of faith to the young . . . 34
Faith deepens with deepening Grace . . 35

SERMON II.

The whole perfection of the rational creation, Angelic and human, is in conformity with God, inwrought by God 37
Both, created to reflect manifoldly the Perfections of God, and to be perfected, above their natural state, in Him . . . . Ib.
Man, in every power of his mind, formed in the Image of God 38

PAGE

Traces of this even in his fallen state and his very sins 40
The restoration of man consists in the restoration of this entire conformity through entire faith . 41
Faith in God or man, perfect or none . . 44
Faith in God, over and above, one virtue, tending towards One Object and One End . . 45
Object of faith one, God; subjects of faith manifold, whatever God has revealed or sanctioned . 47
Faith *in* man, in itself, co-extensive with *the* Faith, proposed to him by God 49
But involuntary ignorance does not vitiate faith . Ib.
Trials of faith, not to the simple, but to the subtle 50
Any deliberate rejection of faith destroys the whole habit of faith . . . . Ib.
Analogy of moral habits . . . Ib.
S. James i. 10. 51
Rejection of faith in one point, involves rejection of all faith, *as* faith, because the Authority is One 52
Whatever remains, is held as natural truth, not as faith . . . . . Ib.
Oneness of faith illustrated, in that decay in faith and practice always begins from one point . 53
Unbelief, whether practical or theoretic, always spreads from that one point . . . 54
Contrast of unbelievers, who never had faith, and of those who have lost it . . . 55
Starting-points of unbelief often seemingly subordinate 57
Mostly not overt, nor fully conscious . . 58
Evil in faith and morals spreads, as separating the soul from God 59
All evil, in faith or practice, really contains within it other evil . . . . Ib.
Heresy seems to degenerate, but in fact becomes more consistent in untruth . . . 60

PAGE

Instances, Arius 60
Nestorius . . . . Ib.
Eutyches 62
Pelagians 65
Tendency of heresy illustrated the more, by partial good, sometimes, in their authors . Ib.
Heresies arose even in opposing heresy and ended in the heresies which they opposed . . 66
One principle of all heresy, to trust men's own judgment as to God rather than God's Revelation . . . . . Ib.
Declarations of Holy Scriptures that faith is One . 68
Man's province to surrender himself to faith . 70
No room for *à priori* reasonings, when there is certain truth . . . . . Ib.
A priori reasonings in matters of human knowledge subservient to fact 71
Yet well-nigh every heresy founded on *à priori* reasonings 72
Jews and Pagans who rejected the Gospel, rejected it on *à priori* notions. . . . 73
Our temptation, not to reject Christ altogether, but to believe on our own terms . . . 74
Men now rebel against God's *Will,* while they acknowledge a presiding *Mind* . . . 75
Distinctions between what we must believe and what we need not believe in Holy Scripture, untenable . Ib.
Existence of evil inexplicable here, both to religion and irreligion 76
If we do not understand the whole, it is childish to claim to understand a part, which depends upon it 77
Instances in which we so act . . . Ib.
All objections could be explained, if the Mystery could be explained, upon which they depend, which Mystery is still acknowledged to be inexplicable . 80
Instances . . . . . Ib.
In natural truths too, we often know the fact better than the hidden cause . . . 82

PAGE

In natural truths, too, it is acknowledged that great truths must be held, notwithstanding lesser difficulties; that what we know must not be abandoned on the ground of what we do not know Ib.

So, by believing we see in part the reasonableness of what we do not fully understand . . 83

Instanced in the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation . . . . . Ib.

Hence we doubt not that the rest too can be explained 84

Meanwhile, our Lord is Light to us, not criticising, but believing 85

Difficulties as to the Faith disappear upon complete submission to God 86

Consider what God Is, what thou . . Ib.

Our Lord teaches the soul, which fully commits itself to Him 87

Note A. on Professor Jowett on the Doctrine of the Atonement 89

Note B. on Professor Powell on Miracles . . 93

ALL FAITH THE GIFT OF GOD.

---

1 Cor. iv. 7.

"*What hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?*"

No one who believes the Gospel can doubt that faith in our Lord Jesus Christ is a gift of God, wrought in the soul by God the Holy Ghost. "[a] By grace ye are saved through faith, and this not of yourselves;" faith too is not of yourselves; "it," faith too, "is the gift of God." And not that living faith only, whereby a man cleaves to Christ in love, but every beginning of, feeling after, drawing towards, tendency to faith, is equally the gift of God.

Yet, before entering either upon the proof or the application of this truth to circumstances of our time, some few points which bear upon it, ought to be made clear. Since the Pelagian heresy sprung up, it has been necessary to state the effects of grace in all its operations on man's heart as a whole: how, without any pre-existing deserts (save evil) on the part of man, God arouses him, touches his heart, enlightens his mind by the Holy Spirit, prepares and disposes him to repent and believe in Christ Jesus;

[a] Eph. ii. 5.

whereas man, throughout this whole course of God's gracious drawing, has the power to receive, reject, retain, part with, that inspiration of God, but has not the power, of his own free-will without the grace of God, to turn, or to desire to turn, to God. As Christ died for all, so to all, who are born within the light of the Gospel of Christ, the grace to turn and prepare themselves for faith, is vouchsafed by God, if they will but receive and obey it ; but by nature we have it not. In this way alone, by surveying the action of the grace of God upon a soul which is hitherto wholly a stranger to grace and turned away from God, can we see or trace the full course of the grace of God. This way of stating the truths of grace has, after S. Augustine, been adopted in our own Articles.

But in our own souls, practically, Divine grace rarely operates altogether in this same order. For we are never, except through our own fault, out of Christ. God, for the most part, anticipates by His gift the trials of elder years. In infancy, we receive the Sacrament of faith. Being then "made members of Christ and children of God," we receive freely, through God the Holy Ghost, the first principle of that spiritual life which is afterwards to be developed. In our childhood we, for the most part, without any opposition of a contrary will in us, receive the faith through the teaching of our parents, amid the operation of God the Holy Ghost on our dispositions and our young hearts. By the mercy and Providence of

God, we, for the most part, receive the faith, before those faculties of the mind are developed, to which the reception of the faith would be a trial. Even thus, we may see how the reception of the faith depends upon the right use of grace; since the faith, communicated in the very same way, takes more or less deep possession of the soul, as the child is, in other respects, in his childish duties, self-government, obedience, prayers, more or less faithful to the grace of God. Some childish unfaithfulness to grace has often laid the foundation of the unbelief of maturer years.

The course of the Christian life, intended for us by God, is continual developement of the grace which in Baptism we received, in "charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned."

Even if unhappily faith is obscured in any, through the indulgence of habits, whether intellectual or sensual, contrary to faith; if even, through marked resistance to grace or habitual neglect of it, love have grown cold, and faith have become an inoperative, historic faith, *that* faith, although at the time destitute of grace, because the soul has parted from grace and love, is still the residuum of past grace. The habit of faith still abides, like a body not yet dissolved, into which Christ may yet recall the soul by His life-giving word, "Young man, I say unto thee arise."

But as is the original character of faith, such is the way in which it is maintained. If man arrived at faith through the mere use of his natural reason, accepting or rejecting what is proposed for his belief

according as the evidence is or is not adequate to satisfy his natural reason, then undoubtedly it would be through unaided exercise of that same natural reason, that his faith must be maintained, strengthened, enlarged, defended; or, if it have been unhappily shaken or lost, then, by that same mere exercise of the understanding must it be consolidated or recovered. If, on the contrary, God works faith in the soul, not without grounds which satisfy reason illumined by His Holy Spirit, but Himself acting, not simply on the reason, but on the will also and the affections, disposing, preparing, arousing, helping, illuminating, justifying, sanctifying, the whole man, then faith, being the gift of God by grace, must be retained in us through grace; then faith will grow with the growth and enlargement of grace; or it will wane through whatsoever lessens grace; and if faith be impaired or destroyed it cannot be demonstrated into any one by mere force of argument, nor can we recover it for ourselves by mere diligent study of human proof, but it must be regained by regaining the lost grace of God.

This question is plainly of great practical moment, in days when both belief in a revelation as a whole is assaulted on many sides, with little novelty but with great confidence; and those who cannot endure to part with their whole faith are still manifoldly tempted to sacrifice its integrity, in order to retain, as they think, such residue of our inherited faith as seems to them most defensible. Saving or justifying faith, all allow, is the gift of God. Holy Scripture expressly

says it. But if faith as a whole is from God, so are also the dispositions towards it.

If the beginning of our faith were from ourselves, then the beginning of our salvation would be from ourselves, not from God. If our belief were the simple result of our own reasoning powers; if it depended upon nothing more, than acquiescing in certain things as true, which we could not help seeing to be true, when they were set before us; if the belief that God has revealed Himself to mankind and has in that revelation taught the truths which He *has* taught, depended upon nothing more than that we could see clearly with our natural understanding the process of proof upon which it rested, then our faith would be a human not a Divine faith. Plainly, there must be much correspondence between human and Divine faith. They must have much in common, both in their groundwork and in the process whereby they are attained; else they would not be designated by one common name. Both human and Divine faith are in things unseen, and of which the senses have no certain cognizance; else they would not be faith. Both depend on the absolute credibility of him in whom the faith is reposed; both must be proof against all lesser appearances, or surmises, or suspicions, which the waywardness of man's own heart, or the doubts of others, might suggest.

Both may be gained by different processes. Human faith, as well as Divine, has its intuitive perceptions, by which it arrives as solidly at its conclu-

sions in some cases, as, in others, by long or laboured conclusions. The perceptions of human faith are quickened or dulled by the moral character; the finest perceptions of human faith are often such as the soul can give least account of. In human faith too, acute intellect will misjudge. Deep love, purity of heart, simplicity of soul, guilelessness of mind, will know where securely to rest its faith, while acuteness of intellect will be at fault, quick in discerning single points, sharp to discover a seeming defect, but not penetrating enough to see the centre on which the character really turns, or enlarged enough to comprehend it as a whole.

Faith in Divine things or in persons sent from God, may rest on direct sight of things invisible, as in S. Paul, or on slow reasoning, as in Nicodemus, or on simple apprehension, as in Nathanael. It may come through the report of others, as among a portion of the Samaritans, or through some unseen attractive might, as in our Lord's words, heard with the outward ears when He was in the Flesh among us, or borne in, at times, upon the inward ear now.

But in whatever way, direct or indirect, through the affections or through the intellect, the soul arrives at faith, whether in God or man, Divine Faith has this over and above, that in it there is an immediate action of God upon the soul. Faith, from first to last, is the gift of God to the soul, which will receive it. God prepares the soul, with its will, not without it, to receive the Faith. God stills the soul,

that it may listen to the Faith; God flashes conviction into the soul, that it may see the truth of the Faith; in those who through His Grace persevere to the end, God seals up the Faith in the soul, that it may keep the Faith which it has received, unchanged, undiminished, unadulterated, the source of life and love and holiness, until faith is swallowed up in the blessed-making sight of Him Whom, unseen, it believed.

God forecometh us in all things. As the beginning of our being was from Him, so from Him also is our re-creation in Christ. Our own free will, as we now, since the fall, have it by nature, floats and sways between good and evil, weak toward good, overmastered by evil. If, unaided by Divine grace, we could make it good, we could make ourselves, of ourselves, better than God made us. We could bestow more upon ourselves than Almighty God. So did not even the good Angels; so cannot any created thing. The good Angels did not make their own wills good. God created them, as He did man, wholly good. God upheld them, freely through His grace choosing Him. They abode in the good will in which God had created them, by abiding in Him; their good will abode in them, because through the grace wherewith He endowed them, they, upheld by Him, clave inseparably to Him, and, by partaking of Him, were fixed in unchangeable bliss through His Unchangeableness.

In us, that will to cleave to Him in which He created us, is, after the fall, through His grace re-created in us. He Who sets Himself before us as the Object of our faith, gives us the will to believe

in Him, if we consent. With us it remains to receive or to have; with God, to give. God wills that we should believe, but not without ourselves. He persuades us, invites us, calls us, works in us, that we should will to believe; He, if we will, removes from us all hindrances within us to believe, attempers every disposition to His truth and faith, subdues in us, whatsoever erects itself or rebels against it. One only thing He doth not; He doth not force us.

God Himself says that the beginning of our faith, as well as our complete faith, is from Himself. "Faith," the Apostle saith, "is the gift of God." "But [b] to you it is given," (ἐχαρίσθη) given as a gift of grace, "in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake." S. Paul blends in one the beginning and the end of the Christian's life. To die for Christ is the crowning act of the Christian's life; sufferings for Christ are the highest gift of grace. What they who suffered in His Name, spake in their hour of trial Christ saith, the Holy Ghost "spake [c] in them;" what they endured, they endured through the power of Christ. "Christ, the Guardian of their faith, fought and conquered in those His servants. He approved them, willing; He aided them, struggling; He crowned them, conquering; rewarding in them with the recompense of His Fatherly goodness and love what He Himself wrought, and honouring what He Himself accomplished in [d] them." Yet not less is it the gift of God, S. Paul says, to believe on Christ than to suffer for Him.

[b] Phil. i. 29. [c] S. Matth. x. 19, 20.

[d] S. Cyprian, Ep. 10. p. 21. Oxf. Trans. Ep. 76, 4. 307. This last was written in immediate expectation of his own martyrdom.

"I was [e] compassionated of the Lord to become faithful." "S. Paul was inspired to speak of his own belief in Christ as being so wholly the grace of God that he speaks of it in a passive form, "I was compassionated by the Lord to be faithful," or a believer, *ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι.* Whence "the compassionated" becomes even a title for those brought, through the grace of God, into the faith of the Gospel. "Who [f] before were not compassionated, but now have been compassionated;" "now ye have been compassionated through their unbelief;" "that through the compassion upon you they too may be compassionated." *οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δέ ἐλεηθέντες. ἠλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ, τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ ἀυτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσι.*

With this coincides his other saying, "It [g] is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." "Not plainly," says S. Bernard," as though any could indeed will or indeed run in vain, but that he who willeth and runneth, should boast not in himself but in Him from Whom he hath both to will and to run." Of himself S. Paul says again, "By [h] the grace of God I am what I am." He reserved no part to himself, as if this were his own, not God's. All which is good in me, all which I have or am of good, *that* I am, by the grace of God. He speaks of his very "I," himself, not of any gifts, graces, wisdom, knowledge of Divine things, inspirations, labours, love, zeal; not of any one thing which God had given him, not of the aggregate of

[e] 1 Cor. vii. 25.
[f] 1 Pet. ii. 10. Rom. xi. 30, 31.
[g] Rom. ix. 16.
[h] 1 Cor. xv. 10.

all God's gifts, but his very self, around whom all these things hung, in whom they were, his very inward self, had become what it was, by the grace of God. The stream is not distinct from the fountain; nor the ray from the sun; nor is the ripened fruit of other kind than the blossom; nor is the perfection of grace the gift of God and the beginning from nature.

Again, as silencing all boastfulness on the part of those who counted themselves somewhat, S. Paul appeals upbraidingly to their hearts; "who [i] maketh thee to differ from another; and what hast thou that thou didst not receive; now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?" If we had not received from God the grace whereby the faint and inoperative velleity, which is, the highest attainment of the natural man, is changed into resolute and effective will, then man might have said, "the very foundation of all faith, our own will to believe, we have altogether from ourselves, not from God: we did not receive that upon which our salvation turns." But now in no part of our life in God, or, (which is the same) of the life of God in our soul, is the root or first spring of our acts from ourselves. We make and can make no one effort or motion; we can exercise no will or desire, without the grace of God. This only have we, that we receive and have what God giveth; plainly we do not receive or have without our will; nor do we against or without our choice receive irresistibly our good will; but

[i] 1 Cor. iv. 7.

the will to receive and have we receive of God. We cannot will by a separate act of our own, without the grace of God. "Not that[k] we are sufficient of ourselves to think," or account, "any thing as from ourselves." Nor as though part were our's, part God's. The Apostle denies that we may claim any thing, any one thing, λογίσασθαι τι, to proceed from ourselves; but all, even although *in* ourselves, or *with* ourselves, from God.

"It[l] is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." He produceth not our will in us, as He produceth ourselves without ourselves; nor doth He work in us, as He worketh in the brute creation. He willeth to do nothing in us without ourselves; we can do nothing good, not even will without Him. But He willeth so to restore in us the harmony with Himself, that whereas He reserveth to Himself the prerogative of re-creating in us what is good, yet in all the rest, He willeth that we should co-operate with Him. He awakeneth, healeth, strengtheneth, upholdeth our will. "God," says S. Bernard, "[m] worketh in us these three things, to think, to will, to perform what is good; to think, *without* us; to will, *with* us; to perform, *through* us. From God then, doubtless, is the beginning of our salvation, and not either *through* us, nor *with* us. But consent and act, although not *from* us, are not yet without us. We must beware lest, when we feel these things done invisibly in us or with us, we attribute them either to our will, which is

[k] 2 Cor. iii. 5. See S. Chrys. ad loc. [l] Phil. ii. 13.
[m] de grat. et lib. arb. c. 14. n. 46, 7.

weak; or to a necessity from God which is none; but to the grace of God wherein He aboundeth. Grace arouseth free will, when it soweth the thought; healeth, when it changeth the affection; strengtheneth, when it leadeth to act; preserveth, lest it fail. But grace so worketh with free will, that it forecometh only in thought, in the rest accompanying; to this end forecoming, that henceforth it may be co-operated with. Yet so what was begun by grace alone is perfected conjointly, so that in each advance they operate unitedly not severally, together not alternately. Grace doth not act in part and free will in part; but they each by an undivided operation, accomplished the whole. Free will doth all, and grace doth all; yet as the whole is *in* free will, so the whole is *from Grace.*"

The whole preaching of the Gospel to us Gentiles is summed up by the Prophet Isaiah, in words which express that God laid Himself open, as it were, to the inmost knowledge of those who knew not of Him so much, as that they ought to seek Him, and who sought Him not. Most literally God says in one pregnant word of the sacred language, "I gave Myself to be inwardly known [n] by those who asked not of Me; I gave Myself to be found of those who sought Me not."

All this agrees with the account which our Lord

[n] Is. lxv. 7, נדרשתי as a reflective, expresses this. דרש signifies to "search earnestly," (as God, after the commandments of God, righteousness) search below the surface (the knowledge of the works of God, Ps. cii. 2.) out of His word (Is. xxxiv. 16.) enquire about things yet unrevealed (from God and His Prophets) Gen. xxv. 22. 1 Kings xxii. 5. 2 Kings xxii. 13. Jer. xxxvii. 7. Ezek. xx. 3. and (in the reflective) of God's allowing Himself to be enquired of. Ezek. xiv. 3. xx. 3, 31. ἐμφανής ἐγενήθην lxx.

Himself gives of the unbelief of such as, having seen the miracle of the loaves, murmured against His teaching, "I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven." They had seen with their own eyes what should have persuaded them, and they were not persuaded. If miracles had been purposed by God to extort belief, belief might have been wrung from them. They had seen far more than those miracles of which Nicodemus said, "Rabbi, we know that Thou art a teacher sent from God, for no man can do the miracles which Thou doest, except God were with him." For two years and a half Jesus had gone up and down among them, working those miracles which Isaiah had foretold that the Christ would work, so that miracle and prophecy already centered in Him. "They had themselves eaten of the loaves and were filled." Yet they believed not. They had a ready plea for themselves, why they need not believe. They had a contradiction on the surface to urge, between what our Lord taught of Himself, and what they themselves knew. "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then doth this man say, I came down from Heaven?" They knew that He was from below. How then could He be from above, and not only "be" but have "come down from Heaven?" Acute answer of human intellect and human ignorance! But why then did Nicodemus so firmly believe? why did these disbelieve? "No man cometh unto Me, unless the Father which hath sent Me draw him." It is a mighty drawing of which our

Lord speaks, a [o] drawing which constrains nature, overpowers the dull heaviness of nature, is stronger to draw than nature to resist; yet a drawing by the inward force of Divine Love, "with the cords of a man," by the inward ray of Divine illumining, revealing to the soul the truth of the Divine words. For so our Lord explains His own words, "it is written in the Prophets, they shall be all taught of God."

By such authorities of Holy Scripture, the doctrines of Semi-Pelagianism were crushed, which denied, in fact, the preventing grace of God, conceding in different ways that the grace of God followed upon the endeavours of man, not that the effectual endeavours of man were called into being by the grace of God. It was then laid down in the Church, "If [p] any one saith that the beginning of faith and the very desire of belief, whereby we believe in Him Who justifieth the ungodly and arrive at the birth of Holy Baptism, doth not, as well as the increase of faith, come to us by the gift of grace, that is, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, correcting our will from unbelief to faith, from ungodliness to godliness, but is in us by nature, he is a manifest adversary of the Apostolic doctrines, since the blessed Paul teacheth, 'We [q] trust that He Who has begun a good work in you, will perform it unto the Day of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

"If any says that mercy is bestowed by God upon us

[o] ἑλκύσῃ. [p] Concil. Araus. ii. A. D. 529. cap. 5. 6. 7. Conc. v. 807. ed Col.

[q] Phil. i. 6. The Council adds, Ib. 29. Eph. ii. 8, 9. and then subjoins, "For they who say that the faith whereby we believe in God is of nature, lay down that all they who are alien from the Church of Christ are in a manner faithful."

believing, willing, desiring, endeavouring, labouring, watching, studying, asking, seeking, without the grace of God, and confesses not, that through the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it taketh place in us, that we believe, will, or are able to do all those things as we ought, and if he subjecteth the aid of grace to man's humility or obedience, and doth not allow that our being humble and obedient is the gift of grace itself, he resisteth the Apostle, who saith, 'what hast thou which thou hast not received?' 'By the grace of God I am what I am.'

"If any affirm that, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Who giveth to all sweetness in assenting and believing the truth, we can, by the force of nature, think as we ought, or choose any good thing which appertaineth to the Salvation of life eternal, or can assent to the saving preaching, that is, the preaching of the Gospel, he is deceived by a heretical spirit, not understanding the words of God Who saith in the Gospel, 'without Me, ye can do nothing,' and that of the Apostle, 'not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.'"

This is so plainly the teaching of our own Article upon free will that it would seem almost superfluous to insist upon it among ourselves, who mean, of course, to accept and believe its teaching. And yet if we turn from what we profess and think we believe, to maxims almost stereotyped among us, or to consider things which are difficulties as to faith, it would seem as if we believed nothing less.

Thus, it is almost a received formula on the evidences of the Gospel, that the province of reason is antecedent to that of faith; that we are on grounds of reason to believe in Revelation, in other words, to receive Faith and then on the ground of Faith, to receive its contents, which are not to be contrary to Reason. True, as is urged, since reason is a gift of God, it will not conflict with His other gift, Revelation, or Faith. But then, what Reason? Reason, such as Adam had it, before the Fall, unwarped by prejudices, unswayed by pride, undeafened by passions, unallured by self-idolizing, unfettered by love of independance, master of itself because subdued to God, enlightened by God, a mirror of the Mind of God, reflecting His Image and likeness after which it was created; a finite copy of the perfections of the Infinite? Truly, no one would demur to the answer of such an oracle as this. A work of God, which remained in harmony with God, must be in harmony with every other creation of God; for both would be the finite expressions of the one Archetype, the Mind of God. But that poor blinded prisoner, majestic in its wreck, bearing still the lineaments to its primæval beauty and giant might, yet doomed, until it be set free, to grind in the mill of its prison-house and make sport for the master, to whom it is enslaved, this, which cannot guide itself, is no guide into the Mind of God.

More truly might that saying be reversed, and it might be affirmed, that the province of reason is after faith, not before. Reason, unaided, cannot even

penetrate into the sphere of the objects of Faith; nor can it, in any case, discern their substance or measure them by earthly laws. But reason, healed, restored, guided, enlightened, by the Spirit of God, has a power of vision above nature, and can spiritually discern a fitness, and correspondence, and harmony in the things of God which, through faith, it has received and believed. But to what end to measure by a crooked rule?

The fall perverted the whole of man's nature; not his sensual appetite only, nor his will, nor his understanding, but his whole being. In its outward act, it was rebellion against God; in its motive, it was pride and ambition; "Ye shall be as gods;" in its effects it was a poison running through his whole physical nature, and rousing his passions into a phrenzied rebellion against himself. And henceforth sensual pleasure stupifies his judgment; passion disturbs it; pride and vain-glory distort it; self-will blinds it. There is not one way only to blindness of spirit. Every thing blinds the mind of man, which is not according to the Mind of God. It is then a poor and insufficent plea, when it has been said in behalf of this or that unbeliever, that he was, what is called "a moral man." It was a short-sighted theory, which was anxious to point out this or that flagrant moral defect in the lives of unbelievers. The fallen spirits have no sensual temptations. Our first parent's sin was spiritual sin. Whatever may have been the inward life of the Pharisees in our Lord's time, (and He Who "resisteth the proud" often leaves them, so that

they fall into disgraceful sensual sin) on the whole, they lived strict, obedient lives. "After the straitest sect of our religion," says S. Paul, "I lived a Pharisee." Our Lord Himself contrasts their lives, at one time with the Publican, at another with the Publicans and harlots[n]; yet, on both occasions, only to warn them, that the grosser sins of the Publicans and harlots did not keep them so hopelessly alien from the Kingdom of God, as the more subtle sins held back the Pharisee. The love of the praise of man made faith impossible. "How[o] can ye believe (πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι,) who receive glory one of another, and seek not the glory which cometh of God only?" "They loved the praise of man, more than the praise of God."

So far then, from a highly intellectual age being a favorable atmosphere for the Gospel, intellect, like every mere natural power, is, unless in so far as Christ subdues it to Himself, in necessary antagonism to the Gospel, both as a whole, and in its parts. The special temptation of high intellect is, to think that, because by its natural powers it understands natural things and the visible creation, therefore it is qualified, more than others, to understand things above nature, and the Mind of the Creator. And therefore it *will* judge, what should be the evidence, the character, the extent, the contents, the effects of a revelation from God; what sort of miracles are to be

[n] S. Matt. xxi. 31, 32, [o] S. John v. 44.

expected and are conformable to reason and to the Nature of God; what should be the structure or clearness of prophecy; what doctrines are consistent with the Nature of God; what God *could* or *could not* have taught; whether He *could* have dispensed with His own laws, or ordinary ways of working; what duties He *could* have imposed; what He *could* have praised; what rational beings, good or evil, there *can* be, higher than man; what the intercourse or influence of such agents towards man *could* be; whether a relation, which the natural intellect of itself would reject, *could* come from God; what dealings with His creatures are consistent with love or justice in God; whether the eternal Existence of God, in Himself, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is true or self-contradictory; whether the Unchangeable God *can* hear prayer.

Natural intellect judges, for itself, all these and many such questions, allowing freely to God whatever does not interfere with itself, granting to God that He is greater than itself, allowing its obligations to Him, that He has made it, and set it in a course wherein, without help from Him, it may attain, as it thinks, to its ultimate perfection. It treats with Him much as one might with a more powerful sovereign; it owns, in some sort, its dependance upon Him, yet so as to maintain an independance of its own. It will own what it cannot help, and will claim for itself all which it is not forced to yield up. It selects from the Attributes of God, what it wills to acknowledge;

and what it will not, it denies. Its own will is its measure of Almighty God. And so it claims to judge, to criticise, to condemn, in the Revelation of God, whatever it assumes to be out of harmony with the Mind of God, because its own has nothing akin to it. Its God then is, in truth, its own creation; its Creator is the creature of its own mind. It invests Him with dignity, intelligence, benevolence, marvellous power, wisdom of contrivance, as a sort of great Architect of the visible world. It will acknowledge gladly all which it likes, so that it is not required to acknowledge any thing which it does not like. But it has no idea of One Incomprehensible Being, containing all things, but contained by none; the Rule of all things, but measured by nothing; of Whose very Being, in that He is a Spirit, man can have no thought; the Mysteries of Whose Nature cannot contradict man's reason, because man has no capacity by which to estimate them; Whose "judgments are a great deep," in which human reason cannot wade, Whose "Wisdom is unsearchable, and His ways past finding out." It has no awe, no reverence, no subjection. It admires, not adores: it is pleased with its own intelligence in admiring, and worships itself and its own wisdom, instead of shrinking into its nothingness in the Presence of its God, to hearken to what God will say to it. We think it strange now, that, because this earth has its moon rolling around it, and we see the sun and stars in their seeming circuit, man should have thought that

sun and stars also circled around this small earth, as the centre of the whole visible creation. And men do *not* think it strange, that man's reason should be the centre, around which all things seen and unseen should revolve; so that from it, all things should be beheld in their due harmony and relations; all should be understood by reference to it; all should be measured by it, the Infinite by the finite. And well were it, were it only the Infinite! But the very ground of the ignorance is that, not contemplating, not meditating, not adoring, not bowing down itself and all its powers before its Maker, its Deity is a mere inanimate abstraction, not He Who Alone Is, and Who, in His Infinite Love and Goodness, made us out of nothing, to have our being in Him.

Every gift of God is plainly good, if it be sanctified. Great intellect may greatly serve God, if it first humble itself to obey Him. But pure intellect, unpenetrated by faith, is in more special antagonism to God, than even intellect imbruted in sensual sins. The sensual blind themselves; they are bowed down to earth, that they cannot see God. The ambitious set up an idol in His stead, worship some shadow of His Greatness, and forget Himself, or are their own gods. To the covetous, mammon is their god; to the gluttonous, "their belly" the Apostle says, "is their god." All these forget God; their lives are one rebellion against God. But it is not the rebellion of direct defiance. Unsanctified intellect has this special evil, that it comes into direct conflict with the

Mind of God Himself. Its field is the all-but-infinite; space, time, mind, being, the laws whereby the Invisible worketh, the mirrors wherein (as far as may be in the flesh) His Attributes are beheld, are its province and its home. It can, in thought, ascend beyond time and space, and can conceive of laws which would extend even into Infinity[p]; it transcends and masters the knowledge of the finite, and so is brought into contact with the Infinite God. Its very track lies across the ways, the workings, the creative power of God, as He ordereth all things in number, weight and measure. It traces His laws and acknowledges the Law-giver; it almost grasps the creation in its thought, and reverences the Creator; it admires His Wisdom, and seems to be made a partaker of that Wisdom, by understanding some portion of it, and admiring it. It has stretched itself out to the bounds of all created things, and searcheth out all perfection. It has traversed, as it thinks, creation after creation, and worlds beyond worlds. And now, having traced the regularity and harmony of all God's natural laws, and found no hindrance to its understanding, will it own that there is a supernatural system, to which all its natural wisdom is not even a stepping-stone; that all its natural knowledge cannot decypher the very alphabet of the supernatural; that all its acuteness, inventiveness, powers of combination, the electric dartings-forth of its thought, the

[p] Price on the Infinitesimal Calculus, Vol. 1. p. 2. c. 9. Principles of Geometry, p. 260 sqq.

lightning rapidity of its conceptions, its piercing penetrating keenness fail it here; that it has, not to discover, but to receive; not to criticise, but to obey; that it must exchange its keen activity for passive acquiescence, nature for Grace; and that its first step towards the Throne of God, is to humble itself at His footstool and say, "Lord, I am but dust and ashes, sinful and blind through inherited sinfulness and my own. Enlighten Thou me that I may see; humble me that I may receive; enlarge me that I may comprehend, what here on Earth may be known of Thee, the Incomprehensible; restrain me that I may not imagine aught of Thee, save what Thou art and hast revealed?"

Yet this is the trial of intellect. In one of the many mansions of the house of the Great Father, it has its own reward, if sanctified. He who "hath[q] made all things for Himself," must have prepared for those wonderful, transcending intellects, whose piercing thoughts are more like intuition than reflection, some separate lustre in that bright galaxy around His Throne. But only if tried, perfected, sanctified. All of man, passions, will, affections, imagination, intellect, have to be tempered, purified, perfected, through the fire of trial without, within by the fire of the Spirit. Intellect, penetrated by the Spirit of God, irradiated by His Light, kindled by the glow of Divine love, reflects to after-ages the light which it has caught, illumines mysteries, guards truth, unfolds

[q] Prov. xvi. 4.

our spiritual nature, orders the whole sum and relations and proportions of Divine and human knowledge. But intellect, unenlightened by Divine light, intuitive as it may be in human things, is blind in Divine. It is not merely, as the acute mathematician may not understand moral or physical science. The knowledge which pure intellect lacks, is not outward but inward; not natural but supernatural. Man may understand the things of man; God only unfolds the things of God; through God only can we understand the things of God. "No man," saith S. Paul, "knoweth the things of God, save the Spirit of God," as no man knows the inward thought of "man, save the spirit of man which is in him." This Spirit Apostles received, that through It they might know and declare the things of God; through this Spirit alone can we understand those same truths, spoken to us in words taught by that same Spirit. For "the natural man," S. Paul goes on, "receiveth," or containeth, "not the things of the Spirit of God, neither *can* he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." S. Paul, as S. James and S. Jude, knows but of those two classes, "natural men," and natural wisdom, i. e. men who have not the Spirit of God, and wisdom, which is earthly, not of God; and spiritual men, and spiritual wisdom; men who have not their souls only, but have the Spirit of the Father and the Son dwelling in them, hallowing them, guiding them, teaching them, enlightening them; and "Wisdom which is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights."

It is part of the dependance in which God seeth it to be good for the creature to abide, that the creature should not know God, except through the Revelation of God. Even Angelic Intelligences behold God, not through their own created vision, but through the light of Glory, which God imparts to them. "In" and "through Thy light, we shall see light." Angels too cannot, through their own created sight, penetrate that light unapproachable, which by its very brightness shrouds from sight the Essence of God; else it were not "unapproachable" to created being. Angels too are comprehended in those sayings, "No [r] one hath seen God at any time, the Only Begotten Son which is in the Bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." "No [s] one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son may reveal Him." Angels too knew not, of themselves, the mystery of the Incarnation and of man's redemption, and longed to look closer into the depth of the mysteries of Divine wisdom and love, shewn and revealed to us. God Alone can of Himself know God; God Alone can comprehend God. Through the brightness of the Divine Light in us, shall we, if, by His grace, we attain, behold, each in our measure and degree, the Infinite, Incomprehensible, Essence of God.

But man has this further weakness through the Fall, that not only can he not know the things of

[r] S. John i. 18. [s] S. Matt. xi. 27.

God, except by the revelation of God, but that very revelation he cannot understand or receive by his natural powers, without the Spirit of God. As the Holy Angels cannot behold God, except through the light of God, neither can man understand the revelation of God, save through the Spirit of God. The words of Divine wisdom may sound over the outward ear; they do not penetrate the understanding, unless God Himself awakes the ear within. So saith our Blessed Lord Himself, "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things, [the mysteries of the faith revealed in Christ Jesus our Lord] from the wise and prudent [in their own eyes, and in knowledge of human things] and hast revealed them unto babes." The preaching was for all; the streams of Divine knowledge and goodness flowed forth for all; the rays of Divine light were shed abroad for all; but the light penetrated not eyes, which prejudice, or pride, or self-will, had blinded; the streams rested in the lowly vallies, not on the mountain sides.

And this their not-hearing and not-seeing, is the very result of thinking that they see and hear. If they had a misgiving that they did not see, they might yet learn of Him Who came to give them light. God's word to the Prophet Isaiah lays great emphasis on this their supposed sight and hearing. "Hear ye, hearing," i. e. go on hearing, "and understand ye not; and see ye, seeing, and perceive ye not." It is pronounced upon them, as the sentence of God

doubtless on their previous impenitence and on their refusal to hear God's previous calls. And so they heard, they criticised, they contradicted; and the more they heard, the more they perverted; and the more confidently they insisted that they understood, the further they were from the grace of God, which would have revealed to them the true meaning of what they heard.

It has doubtless, been startling in early years, that minds so highly endowed with natural gifts of God, creations of His Mind, formed in such perfection of natural beauty, should have failed of the true faith, or overtly rejected God's revelation of Himself. It would have been even perplexing, (as it must be distressing) were acute reason the way to faith, or more capable of appreciating it, or better qualified to detect any flaw in it, or to criticise its substance, or to weigh its evidence, or to unfold the meaning of the Scriptures in which it is deposited. The contrary is proclaimed at the very threshold of the Gospel. Acuteness and power of combination, inventiveness and grasp of intellect, are the fit framers and discoverers and organizers of human science and human philosophy; humility, simplicity, candour of soul, integrity of the will, are the true, because the faithful, recipients of Divine knowledge. The Gospel was "hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes."

Man's intellect was held captive, enslaved, by his will; and his will, by his passions and his pride; God

set free the intellect, not by overpowering arguments addressed to itself, but by bursting the bonds whereby it was held, and removing the scales whereby the light which should enlighten it, was excluded. "I will destroy," God saith, "the wisdom of the wise," of those who through their natural wisdom, thought themselves, or were thought wise in Divine things, "and I will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." Human acuteness is skilled as to human ends; it sees not one step towards the End of ends, its life in God. "Where is the wise" in this world's wisdom? "Where is the scribe," with his human knowledge of things Divine? "Where the disputer of this world," unequal alike to establish solidly natural truth or to impugn Divine? "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Working deeds which man's wisdom holds impossible, teaching truths which it regards as folly, yet by both working what human philosophy had failed to effect. "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Man, through human wisdom and human reasoning, failed even to know God; God substituted faith for reasoning, seeming folly for assumed wisdom, and gave not knowledge only, but salvation. On the one side were arrayed human wisdom, human nobility, human power; on the other God arrayed "the foolish things of the world," "the weak things of the world," "base things of the world, things despised." Through

"unlearned and ignorant men," He imparted to faith, what learning helped not, and ignorance hindered not, to receive. The world through its wisdom, amid the wonders of the creation, knew not the Majesty of the Creator; God taught to fishermen and tentmakers and publicans, the poor and the ignorant and the despised Galileans, the humility of the Incarnation, and the shame of the Cross. Such as they were who called, such were mostly those who were called, " not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble :" but through these God taught to man, man's own misery, and the boundlessness of the Divine Mercy ; He taught him humility through taking on Him the form of a servant and the humiliation of the Cross; but so He opened his eyes to behold, as man might, the Majesty of His Own Being and the depth of His Wisdom, and the greatness of His Holiness, and the Adorableness of His Love. He taught His own Glory through humility which human reason could not receive. He taught of that which is Highest in Himself, through the lowest; through the lowest whom He taught, He taught whatever accounted itself the highest; of the lowest He made the highest. The world despised, scoffed, reviled, hated, rejected, persecuted, trampled under foot and were conquered. "The science of the fishermen overcame the science of the Philosophers;" and Philosophers did service to God, having first bowed their necks beneath the gentle, health-giving yoke of the Cru-

cified. The weak overcame the strong; the unlearned taught the learned; the foolish convinced the wise; for in outward form, it was the weakness of God, and the foolishness of God ; but within were the might of Faith, and the attractions of Divine Love, and the Almightiness of Divine Grace.

As it was in the beginning, so it will be to the end. The form of the warfare may differ, the secret spring remains the same. Unbelief may become courteous, smooth, easy, compromising. The softness of the age may dislike the hardness even of unbelief. It will leave the casket, while it steals the jewel ; it will grant the shadow, so that it secure the substance; it will respect the "idea," while it abhors the reality; it will do homage to a painted lifeless semblance of truth, so that we will substitute its phantom for the living "truth, as it is in Jesus." But as faith is one, so unbelief is one. Mysteries which the human mind cannot fathom; absolute submission to the will of God; untampering acceptance of all, the minutest truths of God; unchangeableness of the Faith amid the changes and progress of human science ; oneness of the Faith amid the conflict of human opinions; dealings of God, which man must adore, not scrutinize; treasures of Divine grace in earthen vessels; reasonings which themselves spring from a hidden, illuminating, wisdom; —the human unsanctified intellect hates these with an unvarying, deadly hatred; it will scoff at what it dares, explain away, what the average reverence of the age

will not allow to be treated with scorn, but never will it accept them, until itself be changed by the All-powerful Grace of God.

But our Lord still says to His own, "Greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world." Faith, being a Divine gift, is mightier than human reason. You may often not yourselves be able to develope in words the grounds or the strength of your convictions. You may be tempted to be vexed or disquieted in yourselves, because words of God, which stamp the faith upon your own souls, seem to another, unconvincing; or because truths, which to you are as your own souls, and are inwrought into your very souls and are a part of them, seem to others as "idle tales and they believe them not." The grounds of faith are often the more difficult to be produced in detail, even because Faith is a Divine Gift. The very deepest principles of Faith are often those which can least be analyzed. Faith was anterior to reasoning; it is more comprehensive than reasoning; it outlives reasoning. It is a centre to which all reasoning converges, which countless lines of reasoning intersect; but itself contains them all, and is contained by none. The distinctive colours into which faith's primal light can be resolved, may be counted; but its piercing light and kindling glow are not in the resolved ray. Faith has a direct power over the soul, and speaks to it, and is heard by it, because it is from God. Words of Scripture which express its truth touch a chord of the soul

which cannot but respond, because it has been attuned to it by God. As when our Divine Lord was in the flesh, "the[t] very brightness and majesty of the hidden Divinity, which shone through His Human Countenance, drew at first sight" those unto Himself, who had eyes to see it, and the Apostles were converted and left their all, and followed Him without delay, though they had seen no miracles nor any other token of Divine authority, so now too, His words speak to the ear of those who are His, with a Divine force, because they are the living words of the Eternal Word.

The very presence of Faith is God's witness upon earth. He Who "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings perfected praise," and by "the weak things of the world confounds the things that are mighty," even now overawes all but conceited unbelief, by the simple conviction of faith. Its dogmatism chafes the world, even because in the presence of its firm rootedness, the world feels the more its own unstayedness. If, but for a moment, amid the parting clouds of human opinions, theories, speculations, guesses, reasonings, the soul's eye catch but one glimpse of that deep azure sky of faith in its serenity, it feels that it has seen something deeper, higher, calmer, clearer, of more piercing beauty, than all which sweeps over it and shrouds it at times from sight. For when opinion vacillates, scepticism sus-

[t] S. Jerome on S. Matth. ix. 9. see Note F. on Tertullian, p. 255. Oxf. Tr.

pects the truth, doubt misgives, reason argues, speculation clouds, imagination fails, their faith *knows* what it believes, more certainly, than any object of the senses; as certainly, although not as vividly as if God had quickened its eye to see what it shall see hereafter. Faith knows more certainly than the senses; for the senses may deceive us, God cannot. Faith knows with absolute certainty; for "faith," the Holy Ghost saith, "is the substance of things hoped for." Faith makes the objects of faith present to the soul; it gives them, through its certainty, a substance and subsistence in the soul; faith knows by an infused light that which naturally passes knowledge; faith has, enfolded in it as it were, the germs and rudiments of things to come, and which it believes. For "we *know* in Whom we have believed." "[x]And this is life eternal, that they might *know* Thee the Only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent." To the Christian, his home in heaven is as certain as if he had seen it with his bodily eyes, although eye hath not seen nor ear heard the nature or the fulness of its joys. Faith "endureth,[y] as *seeing* the Invisible."

But since faith is the gift of God through grace, whatever injures grace, weakens faith. Faith may live on for a time without love, and become what is called an historic faith. But faith without love has no root. For we are "rooted and grounded in love."

[x] S. John xvii. 3. [y] Heb. xi. 27.

It is the last judgment of God upon the soul which *will* not live as it believes, that at the end it believes as it lives. But, short of this abandonment of the soul, whatsoever injures grace in the soul, injures faith. Of direct sins against faith, I will speak, with God's help, next Sunday. But, indirectly, every wilful sin is, so far, a denial of faith, and weakens faith. Intellectual, as well as moral, sins are, if wilfully entertained, antagonists to faith. Faith is based on humility, rooted in love, directed through a holy will, fed by contemplation, quickened by devotion, nurtured by study of the words of the Eternal Word, strengthened by spiritual growth, sees through purity of soul, lives in action. So then, it is weakened by the opposite of all these. Pride rebels against it, impurity is dulled to it, indevotion chills it, worldliness chokes it, negligence lets it slip, an unholy will wills that it should not be; and all in common loose the soul's hold of faith, because they weaken grace, through which the soul has power to hold.

Many things will combine to wrest it from you, my younger brethren. Through one thing only can you hold it, the grace of God. New, though false, lights dazzle at the outset of life; novelty attracts; the old faith may be pictured to you as antiquated; a strict oneness of faith as illiberal; the very Love of God is set in array against the Revelation of God, as though God could not mean what yet He has said; belief in God, as He has revealed Himself, may

be pictured to you as derogatory to God. "Go not after them, nor follow them," is your Saviour's warning as to those who shall come in His Name, and whom He hath not sent. Old must the faith be, since as soon as man needed redemption, the Redeemer was promised, and the truths of the Gospel lay implicitly involved in the revelation to Adam; and He Who eighteen hundred years ago, more fully declared it as the power of God unto salvation, changeth not. "One" must it be, for contradictories cannot both be true, and He has said, there is "one Faith," as there is "One God" and "One Lord." Independant it must be of the progress of the human mind, since Faith relates to eternal truths, about which human reason would, by itself, dimly grope, the Being and the Ways of the Infinite, which human reason cannot grasp, nor fathom, nor survey, nor discover, nor re-order.

Yet faith, too has progress as well as grace; but as the reward of faith received, and grace well-used; faith for faith, and grace for grace. Simple faith which believes that it may understand, understands more and more by the help of God, because it believes. It longs to discover no new truths, but to love more deeply, and contemplate more truly, and cleave more constantly, and be conformed more wholly, to Him in Whom it has believed; and as it meditates, the fire kindles, and a ray from the Eternal Truth fills it with brightness, and light from the Eternal Light dissipates its remaining darkness, lays open what was

hidden, makes plain what was doubtful, deepens what was believed, draws the soul on to love more deeply what, by the light of faith, it has seen, until faith brings it to the Palace of the Eternal King, where it beholds, face to Face, Him Whom it has believed, dwells in Him, on Whom it has dwelt, is joined for ever to Him, to Whom it here clave by love, the Co-Eternal Trinity, One God, Blessed for evermore.

REAL FAITH ENTIRE.

Rom. i. 4.

By Whom we have received Grace and Apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations for His Name.

The whole relation of the creature to the Creator in its perfected state, is and will be, that the creature, knowing itself to be nothing but what it is by the will of God, cleaves to Him, upheld by Him, and finds its bliss in that inseparable union with Him. God made all things to have their perfection in Himself. Each thing was formed to represent, after its kind, some perfection of God. Manifold in their varieties, because each one can picture but some little beauty or goodness of the All-Perfect and the Infinite, all created beings unite in one Centre and one Principle of their being, in that all are from One, all tend to One, to repose in His Perfection. Each was in itself nothing. Not only was each, even the most perfect, as darkness compared to the boundless brightness of the Divine Light, but each retained its perfection, only through the continual inworking of the Creator. God formed each for its own special

end, its own special good, that it should find and attain the special perfection of which it was capable, by participation of His own Goodness, in some likeness to It. All rational creation was framed to find its full perfection, not in that which is simply according to its nature, but in that which is above its own nature, bestowed upon it by a supernatural participation of the Divine Goodness.

Not this our rational creation only, but Angels and Archangels, Cherubim and Seraphim, and each Angelic order, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers, He formed very good, not to retain what was good in them, apart from, and independant of Himself, but by Himself to be maintained in it. He formed us holy, good, righteous, wise; but to remain such by an ever-present working of His Spirit, illumined, sanctified, beatified by His Indwelling Presence, ever deriving anew from God the goodness which He continually supplies.

To this condition God in His mercy wills to restore us through faith. Man was formed, God tells us, in the Image of God, after Their Likeness[a], the Likeness of the All-Holy Trinity. Every power and faculty of the soul bore some trace of its likeness to its Maker. They were shadowy representations of some aspect of the Infinite Mind. In God all is One. His attributes are, even in thought, inseparable from Himself. His Power, His Will, His Goodness, His

[a] Gen i. 26.

Greatness, His Wisdom, His Blessedness, are Himself. For He is One simple Essence. The Very Persons of the All-Holy Trinity, in that mode of Existence which belongs to God, in-exist in One another, in perfect Oneness.

In this Image and Likeness of the All-Perfect God, man was made, his various powers shadowing attributes of God, which, although inseparable from God, we, as finite, can only conceive of, (as far as we can conceive of them) when set before us apart. But so, the immortality of man is a faint shadow of the Eternity of God; man's forethought, of the Divine Providence; man's intuition, of the Divine Intelligence; man's memory, of the Divine Knowledge; man's imagination, of God's conception of all things possible, though they are not. More plainly yet, man's will, power, desire to communicate himself, love, complacence, tenderness, justice, truth, are imparted copies of God's Infinite Perfections. Nay, those three especially, memory, reason, will, have, both in earlier[b] and later times of the Gospel, been thought to be a shadow of the All-Holy Trinity in Itself. "That Holy and Eternal Trinity," says S. Bernard[c], in a passage of most condensed thought, "that Holy and Eternal Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, One God; Supreme Power, Supreme Wisdom, Supreme Goodness, created a certain trinity after Their Image and Likeness, to wit, the reasonable soul: which

[b] see S. Augustine Confessions, xiii. 11. p. 283. and note t. Oxf. Tr.

[c] Serm. 45. de Divers. p. 1186, 7. ed. Mab.

therein showeth forth some trace of all that Supreme Trinity, in that it consisteth of memory, reason, and will. Moreover, He created it such, that, abiding in Him, it might be happy in the participation of Him; if turned away from Him, whithersoever it should betake itself, it should remain miserable. But this created trinity chose rather, through the motion of its own will, to fall, than by the grace of its Creator, through free will, to stand. It fell then through suggestion, delight, consent, from that supreme and goodly trinity, power, wisdom, purity, into a contrary foul trinity of weakness, blindness, impurity. For memory became weak and powerless; reason, rash and clouded; will, impure. Moreover memory, which, while standing, meditated on the power of the simple Essence of God, falling therefrom, was broken and dashed into three parts, carnal, cumbersome, empty thoughts. Reason fell into threefold ignorance; of good and evil, of truth and falsehood, of fitting and unfitting. The will, into lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes, and pride of life. There is a trinity whereby we rise again, faith, hope, charity. These have threefold subdivisions. For there is faith of commands, of signs, of promises: there is hope of pardon, of grace, of glory: and there is 'charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.'"

Even in man's fallen state, he still for the most part, in what he pursues, pursues something which has a perverted likeness to what, in God, is good.

Even seeming good must have a likeness to the One real Good. All things which have any loveliness in them, must have their loveliness from God; man, however fallen, corrupted, decayed, perverted, still bears such impress of the image wherein he was created, that he seeks as his end something akin to the Attributes of God. "Souls in their sins," says S. Augustine[d], seek but a sort of likeness of God, in a proud and perverted, and, so to say, slavish freedom." Pride[e] imitates God's high Majesty; ambition, His Glory; cruelty abuses His Power; vanity receives the Praise due to Him; wanton tenderness is a corruption of Love; luxury distorts that "fulness and never failing plenteousness of incorruptible pleasures" which is with Him; prodigality caricatures His bountifulness; covetousness, His richness of possession; envy longs for His excellency; anger perverts His indignation; even sloth imitates unseasonably the everlasting rest of God, into which we shall one day, through the grace of God, enter. Strange sovereignty of good, that man, even when most perverted, must still chase after, in the creature, some shadow of what is to be found only in the Creator!

This ruin God willed to restore, amid increased difficulties, entailed through Adam's sin, but through super-abundant grace, bestowed through the Merits of the Redeemer. Adam had original righteousness, and the grace of God through which to stand; we

[d] de Trin. xi. 5.

[e] abridged from a beautiful passage in S. Aug. Confessions, ii. § 13. p. 25. Oxf. Tr.

have, amid our inborn corruption, the Righteousness of Christ, and the presence of Christ and the Might of Christ, wherewith, when fallen, to arise. But although our weakness is aggravated, and the Divine might imparted to us is enlarged; although we have the power of Christ's Spirit within us, wherewith to remedy the weakness inherent to us; still the purpose of God, to be accomplished in us, is the same; the character of the trial is, in its general outline, the same; the weapons whereby we must conquer, are the same. Entire conformity of the whole powers and faculties of the creature to the Creator is the end to be accomplished in us; the victory which overcometh the world, is entireness of faith.

The trial set before Angels and men was, with their free-will through the grace of God, wholly and entirely to believe God, and, believing, to choose the will of God. The end proposed to them was, so believing and so choosing, to be perfected in His Perfection. Both were created, knowing that they had all good which they had, from God. Both had their choice to receive from God, or to seek as their own, whatever was yet lacking to their perfection.

The Angels who received and used the grace of God, to long for and to find their everlasting blessedness, above themselves, in God, stood. The Angels who, following their bad chief, in pride said, "I[f] will be like the Most High," either[g] seeking as the bliss

[f] Is. xiv. 14. [g] Aquin. i. q. 63. art. 3.

of their being, that which God had not assigned them, or seeking what they sought by the virtue of their own nature, not by the aid of God ("*I* will be like the Most High") fell.

Man's trial was in kind the same. By faith man would have stood, believing what God said, cleaving to Him with unwavering, unclouded, peaceful faith and trust, until, his painless probation over, he were fitted to be translated into the Beatific sight of God. Through want of faith man marred his whole nature. He desired out of God what God willed him to find in God; he judged hardly of God, as though God had forbidden him what was good and profitable to him. From pride came faithlessness; from faithlessness, disobedience; from his own disobedience to God, the disobedience of his appetites and passions to himself.

Through pride of independance and through faithlessness man fell. Through the submission and obedience of faith, God willed to restore him. Rebellion had spread through the whole of man; the restoration of man was to be through entire conformity to the Mind of God. God had made man wholly for Himself. His whole self, his will, his reason, his memory, his affections, He made to find their perfection and their bliss in Himself; to be in harmony with Him; united with Him, to reflect Him; and, reflecting Him, to glorify Him. The entire conformation of man's whole self to God is the end of all God's dispensanations towards him, from the Death of the Incarnate

Son, to the minutest trial by which, through His own Grace, God ripens a single soul for eternity. In eternity, this entire conformity will *be.* In time, it is to be *formed* in us. And this entire conformity to God, is to be formed through entire faith in God. Adam's faith failed him in one thing, and he wholly fell. So then there is to be worked in us an entire conformity of will, affections, reason, with the Mind of God; and *this* is broken, if man *wilfully* withholds in any respect either his will or reason or affections, and submit them not to the Mind of God. The mean whereby this conformity is to be wrought in us, is entireness of faith; and *this* is broken, if we in any respect wilfully withhold our faith from the revealed Mind of God.

Faith, whether in God or man, is an implicit, full, unswerving reliance in the being who is the object of faith. If it is not absolute or perfect it is not faith. It may be, as to man, circumscribed in its extent, but, within that compass, it must be absolute. If in matters of affection we trust husband or wife or child; if in matters of commercial honesty we trust those with whom we have dealings of trade; if in matters of public faith we trust the honesty of politicians or political enemies; if in matters of science we receive conclusions unproved to us, but which have been, (as the universal belief informs us on the knowledge of those whom we trust) demonstrated to others; one single flaw destroys the whole faith.

There may remain opinion, probability, more or

less, according as the flaw goes deeper into the heart of that which is the subject of our faith, or lies near the surface. But it is even a common phrase among us, on the first disappointment in some one, in whom, in whatever matter, we had rested our faith, "I have lost all faith in him," "my faith in him is all gone."

We may afterwards find and acknowledge ourselves to have been mistaken; we may keep our judgement, more or less, in abeyance; or the object of our faith may himself no longer be the same (as one who is repentant and converted is no longer the same man,) but so long as the object is the same, and the flaw undoubted, we may have hope or good opinion; we may hold a thing to be likely; we may have ground enough to act on; we may, by circumstances, be constrained to act as if we had faith; but we have it not. Whatever be the subject of our faith, the authority, (whatever it is) must be absolute. For what is doubtful in one point is doubtful as to all. There is no more authority as to any point which remains, than to that one which is gone.

Whether the subject of our faith be others' discoveries in science, or in maxims of morals, or truth of history, or honesty in intercourse, our faith if betrayed, perishes wholly. Faith then is one and indivisible. It depends on the absolute credibility of him on whom we rely, that he knows certainly that for which we depend upon him, and that he tells us with undoubted truth what he certainly knows. But faith in God has this, over and above faith

in man, that it is one virtue, tending towards One Object and One End[h]. God is the One *Object* of faith, in that God in Whom it centres, is the Primal, Essential, Uncreated, Truth, from Whom is all truth, the Archetype, Example, Pattern, Rule of all truth, to Whose very Being all falsehood is a contradiction, Whose very Nature it is, to communicate the Truth which He has and Is. God is the One *End* of Faith, in that God, Who has proposed Himself as the "exceeding great Reward" of Faith, is the Highest Good, the Fountain of all Good, having in Himself and being all manner of Good, so that in all eternity, all created being, yea, all possible creation, could not unitedly exhaust the fulness of His Good, or of any one side or aspect of His Goodness. For all possible creation is and must be finite; and no multiplication of the finite can measure or reach the Infinite. Faith, then, is borne towards God, as its Highest Object and its Highest End; faith bears the whole soul towards God; faith knits it to God; faith retains the whole soul in its right relation to God. Faith is one habit of mind towards God. Man is not man's centre. Guilelessness and unsuspiciousness are graces, but faith in any particular man is no duty. If faith in one man is destroyed, faith becomes more cautious where it shall rest, but it may still revive towards others. Whatever touches faith in God in one point, touches the whole

[h] Aq. in iii. Dist. 23. q. 2. art. 1. concl.

spiritual being. It is perilous to touch even a mistaken faith. For since the whole of Divine faith rests to each on One Authority, one mistake seems to shake all which rests on that one authority. Even as to mistaken faith, it is safer to expand and enlarge what is true, so that what is not true should fall off, as it were of itself, well-nigh unperceived.

But if true faith is touched in one point, the whole relation to God is changed. This may take place in many ways. The subjects of faith are manifold; the Object and Source of faith is One, God. Whatever God reveals to us, proposes to our belief, sanctions in any way distinctly with His own Authority *that* is matter of faith. Some things God reveals to us of which human reason is not cognizant, for which it has no standard, nor measure, nor plumbline to fathom them, which it can neither know beforehand, nor demonstrate, when made known to it by revelation. But besides these things absolutely unknown to, and unknowable by man's natural reason, there are other truths as to God and ourselves, handed down originally from Revelation to Adam, which became part of the stock of human knowledge, and to which the more thoughtful minds of the Heathen wise more or less assented. On these truths too God has been pleased to set His seal, because, however reflective souls may have revived or re-discovered or disinterred them, when lost, from heaps of rubbish which overlaid them, they were hardly learned by the few, lacking in authority and unin-

fluential to the many, and mingled probably with error for all. These too the superadded authority of God transmuted, from the vagueness of human opinion to the certainty of Divine Faith. Such were e. g. the Unity of the Divine Essence, or the corruption of our human nature, or the hope of its restoration. It matters not, in this respect, whether God has revealed Himself, and His attributes which are Himself, in plain words or in acts of His Divine Government of mankind which He has declared; whether He teach immediately, as to those, who are the organs of His revelation, Moses or the Prophets or the Apostles, or mediately, as to those, to whom that Revelation is conveyed or transmitted; whether, as in the New Testament, He declares beforehand that He will put His words into the mouths of men inspired by Himself, or whether, as to the Old, He stamps with His own authority writings which by His Spirit they have written. God gives, in each case, tokens whereby they to whom the revelation is addressed, may know that it is He Who speaks. Whatsoever it be, which God has sanctioned, whether it be moral truth, or lesson of history, or interpretation of prophecy, or argument of His inspired Apostles, or harmony of the two Testaments, or discovery as to the soul, or the influences of evil beings either upon soul or body, or the resurrection of this same flesh, or the eternity or nature of future punishment, or the character of single actions, or judgments as to individuals other than we should have

expected or inspiration of books of Holy Scripture—whatever it be, to which God hath set His seal,—*that* becomes matter of faith. *Before*, it might have been matter of human knowledge, but fallible; *now*, it bears the stamp and impress of Him, Who can neither deceive, nor be deceived. What results from human understanding alone, has but human certainty. The river does not arise above its source. The sanction of God absorbs the human in the Divine.

Faith, as a habit *in* man, is in itself co-extensive with "*the* Faith," i. e. that which is proposed *to* man for his belief. Accidentally they may differ. Partial ignorance of any matter of faith, if that ignorance is wholly involuntary, not self-contracted, and the defect does not lie in the will, does not vitiate man's faith. For the characteristic of Divine Faith is, that the understanding is moved, not by any demonstration of human reason, but by the will, acted upon, enlightened, empowered by God. The character of the will, whether or no it subjects itself to the expressed and understood Will of God, not the clearness of understanding, nor accuracy of conception, nor fulness of knowledge, determines the relation of the soul to God. The simplest mind which believes in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and that there is but One God, believes really and savingly the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in Unity. He who believes that God the Son for us and for our salvation became Man, really and sa-

vingly believes the doctrine of the Incarnation, although he knows none of the other truths, involved in these simple statements.

The trials of faith do not lie in simple apprehension of the truth, *what* we are to believe. This, "they who run," can, if simple-minded, "read." The trial lies, not with "the foolish things of the world," or "the weak things of the world," or "things despised." They have their own trials, but not this. The lowly find it not hard to pass through the lowly door. Hard to flesh and blood was the Apostles' lot, to forsake all, to be as "the offscouring of all things" and to "die daily." But they clung not to their own conceptions of the Christ. They laid aside, one by one, their thoughts what He *should be*, in sight of what He *was*. The trial of faith lies with acuteness, or subtlety, or inventiveness, whether these will receive with simplicity what God has said, as He has spoken it, or whether they *will* make the revelation of God to mean what they will, bending it, if they can, to their own thoughts, or if they cannot bend it, breaking it and themselves against it.

But since God, the Object of Faith, is One, and the substance of the Faith is one, viz. whatsoever God has proposed to our faith, and the habit of faith in the soul towards God is one, then any deliberate rejection of the Faith in any one point is, in fact, a rejection of the whole habit of faith.

God Himself has taught us this as to His moral law, as also the principle upon which it rests.

"Whosoever[1] shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." And the ground which He assigns is this, that the law is one whole, given by One Lawgiver. Whatsoever then offends wilfully against any one law, offends against that whole, of which the one law is a part, and despises the whole Authority Who gave the law. "For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art a transgressor of the law." He is *just as much* a criminal, although *not so great* a criminal, as if he had broken all. He has as truly turned away from God, the Centre of our being, and turned to something out of God, although he has not turned away so wholly, or so far, as if he had turned away from Him in all. A robe is one whole, and the whole is torn, if one part is torn; one discordant note spoils the whole harmony; the failure of one link destroys the whole chain. Righteousness is one robe, enveloping our whole being; one harmony, making our whole souls into one; one chain, binding earth to heaven, and our souls to God. The principle of love is one. On the principle of love "hang all the law and the prophets." Whoso wilfully offends against one law of love, violates the whole principle of love upon which they hang. He breaks the law as a whole, though not the whole which is in the law. What of the law he still keeps, he does not keep from

[1] S. James i. 10.

the principle of love or obedience, or reverence of God; for these would hold alike in all. He only does not break what he yet refrains from breaking, because he is not tempted so strongly. He has broken it in will, if he has not broken it in fact.

The principle, then, of the oneness of both faith and obedience, is, that they are directed towards One, and come from the authority of One, Who reveals what we are to believe and commands what we are to do. Faith is obedience to His revelation, as such; and obedience is faith in *Him* Who, in His commands, bids us deny ourselves, and promises to give us Himself. He who wilfully rejects any truth proposed to him by God, does in fact reject God as the Supreme Truth, the Fountain of all truth; as he who disobeys any one command does, in fact, reject God, as the Supreme Good, the Rule and Measure and Source of all good. And as he who rejects one command, performs any other moral duty (in whatever degree he does perform any) not from the authority of God, which he has rejected, but from some conformity to his taste or natural feelings, or because his whole moral sense, which he has by nature, is not yet corrupted, or the lingering grace of God still withholds him; so he who rejects any one revealed truth, does not hold whatever other truth he does not part with, out of submission to the authority of God Who has revealed it, but because it approves itself in some way to his own natural mind and judgment. What he holds, he holds of

himself, accounting it to be truth, not as faith. In natural things, too, a man may hold some truth belonging to a science whose principles he does not know, and whose truth consequently he could not establish. Unless he holds such truth on the authority of others, it is to him plainly a mere matter of opinion, although he may imagine to himself that he holds it as certain truth. Even so, a man may suppose that he holds, as of faith, any truth which he believes as to Almighty God; yet unless he believes God in all things, he does believe Him in nothing. He holds then, a truth above nature as to God, as in their degree did the Heathen also, but he does not hold it from God.

As faith and obedience agree in this same law and principle, that since their very essence consists in the creature's cleaving wholly to its Creator, both if injured in one point, are injured as wholes, so also they agree in the results of this law. In both, the principle of decay, beginning from that one point, spreads overtly through the whole substance, whether of faith or practice. The links lie side by side; you do not see, until you attempt to move them, that they have no hold on one another. The bough is still green; flowers or fruit still rest upon it; it still has some freshness from the Vine; you do not see till the morrow, that it *is* severed, that the flower fadeth, and the fruit is withered.

The sin spreads so soon as the temptation spreads. Hence Heathen wisdom also saw, that one who

should have one virtue perfectly, must needs have all virtues, and that one who "notably[k] failed as to one, had in fact none." Such a man may, from natural inclination or custom, or because such acts cost him nothing, do acts, which may seem like virtues. But any stronger temptation shews that they have no root in him. He sacrifices at once his seeming virtues to his master-vice. Hence that phænomenon in characters of history, which have in them some nobleness, how a man with great faults and, as it is said, great virtues, will, on some signal occasion, fail in those very virtues.

No one who departs from God, by departing in any one point from the revealed Will and Mind of

[k] "If thou confess that thou hast not one virtue, it must be that thou hast none." Cic. Tusc. ii. 14. quoted by Aq. 1. 2. q. 65. Art. 1. "Virtues attend upon one another not only in that he who hath one hath all, but also that he who doth any thing whatever according to one, acts according to all, nor is he a perfect man who hath not all virtues, nor is that a perfect action which is not done according to all virtues." Chrysippus in Plutarch de Stoicor. repugn. n. 27. ed. Wytt. "They say that the good and honorable man is perfect because he is wanting in no one virtue; but that the bad on the contrary is imperfect, because he partakes of no one virtue." Stob. Eclog. L. ii. c. 7. p. 196, 8. ed. Heer. see numerous Jewish sayings in Schoettgen on S. James, ad loc. "Virtues are, as it were, connected and concatenated together; so that he who has one seems to have more." S. Ambrose on S. Luke, L. v. n. 63. "One virtue without another is either none at all or imperfect." S. Greg. Moral. L. 22. init. see further T. 2. p. 546, 7. Oxf. Tr. "The virtues which are in the mind of man, although they are each conceived differently, are no ways separated from one another, so that whosoever should be equal in fortitude, for instance, would be equal in prudence too and temperance and justice. For if you should say that they are equal in fortitude, but that the one excels in prudence, it follows that the fortitude of the other is less prudent: and so they are not equal in fortitude either, since the fortitude of the one is more prudent. And so you will find as to the other virtues, if you go over them with the same consideration." S. Aug. de. Trin. vi. 4. quoted by Aq. l. c. See also S. Aug. on the passage of S. James, Ep. 167. ad Hieron.

God, has any standing-ground where to rest his foot. Practical unbelief spreads to the defacing of the whole moral attributes of God; theoretic unbelief widens, until it has invaded His whole Being. Either also branches out into the other. For speculative error, in that it conceives of God, as other than He is, almost of necessity conceives of His creatures' relation to Him, as other than it is; and practical disbelief, as bearing upon the attributes of God, in itself implies that His Holiness, Righteousness, Justice, Love, Wisdom, Goodness, are other than they are. For since God requires of us nothing arbitrarily, but only what is for our own well-being and required by His Holiness and Wisdom, then sin, by rebelling against these laws, denies His Wisdom in commanding them, and His Justice in punishing their violation.

This effect too of parting with one single point of faith, as of practice, is the more visible, in that the poison spreads gradually from that centre. "No one ever suddenly became wholly debased," was a Heathen proverb, as to moral declension. No one, one may say, suddenly became wholly an infidel. There is this obvious difference between one who never was within the Gospel, and one who, having been admitted into the Faith, parts with it. To the native infidel, who rejects the Gospel, all alike is matter of scoffing and derision. He looks but for materials of his scornful profanity. There is no oneness in his attacks on the Faith. He takes it up

or lays it down, as something uncouth, which he cannot make out, in which he sees no entireness, no principle, and out of which he snatches at hazard something which he may burlesque or make to subserve or shield his infidelity. Those who have watched the unhappy minds which part from the Faith, have seen how the departure starts from some one point. Some have themselves related of themselves these "phases" of unbelief; in others they have been observed. The course may have been longer or shorter; they may have more or less consciously admitted, at first, a principle which was inconsistent with their faith; they may have been retarded more or less, in following out their own principle; they may have struggled even piteously in their downward course, clinging the more desperately, for the time, to the fragments of truth by which they yet held in some sort to a Living Personal God, through the very anticipation that these too would, like the rest, soon elude them[1]; they may have veiled their unbelief from themselves, or a surrounding

[1] "Sterling's gainsaying had given way on many points [1839]; but on others it continued stiff as ever, may be seen in that Article [on Mr. Carlyle himself]: indeed he fought Parthian-like in such cases, holding out his last position as doggedly as the first: and to some of my notions he seemed to grow in stubbornness of opposition, *with the growing inevitability*, and never would surrender." Carlyle's Life of T. Sterling, p. 249. He had said of Sterling in 1835, "In fact, it became clear to me more and more, that here was nobleness of heart striving towards all nobleness: here was ardent recognition of the worth of Christianity, for one thing, but no belief in it at all, in my sense of the word belief;—no belief but one definable as mere theoretic moonshine, which would never stand the mind and weather of fact. Nay, it struck me farther that Sterling's was not intrinsically, nor had ever been in the highest or chief degree, a devotional mind." Ib. p. 163, 4.

atmosphere of laxity may have allowed them longer to deceive themselves; the veil may, at last, have been drawn off their eyes by a seeming accident[m], or they may have unravelled deliberately the articles of their faith. But this is a characteristic of all who have parted with faith, that they began with some one point. They parted, as they thought with one point of faith; the event shewed that they parted with the Faith itself. And this is the more illustrative, because those first points of deflection would often not seem at first sight to have been cardinal points. S. Augustine relates[n] how one tormented by flies, fell through impatience, into the snare of the Manichee, and came to deny that man also was the work of the Good God. The Pantheism of Protestant Germany began in the denial of the possessions by devils related in the Gospels. A disbelief in the doctrine of transmission of original sin, even amid the acknowledgement of the facts of man's own evil, has been the prelude to Pantheism. Satan skilfully adapts his temptations to the peculiar structure of each mind. In faith, as in morals, "The cost is in the first step." The rest follow. But the very variety of the points, whence the parting with the actual Faith began, shews the more, that that on which the whole issue turned, was not the specialty of the point of faith itself, but the fact that the unhappy man did part with what was of faith.

[m] Autobiography of Blanco White.
[n] Hom. 1. in S. John, § 14. p. 13. Oxf. Tr.

Most commonly, also the first unsubmission of the soul to God's revealed truth is not overt. Whether in faith or morals the soul will, if it can, blind itself from seeing the nature of its own acts. It would seem obvious, that if any one overtly denied any thing which God had revealed, acknowledging to himself that what he denied was part of that which claimed to be a revelation from God, he would thereby destroy his whole belief in that revelation. For, plainly, the same fountain cannot "send forth sweet water and bitter." What comes from God must be wholly true. Any, therefore, the very slightest admixture of untruth, in what claims to come from God, vitiates that claim. The subtlety of Satan then has been, to pursuade persons to reject what was God's truth, at the same time teaching them to persuade themselves, that what they parted with, was not really of God. That first act of faithlessness and disobedience in man's fall has been the type of other first acts of rejecting the commands or the truth of God. "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" It is so sore a thing to part with God, either in faith or in deed, that the soul clasps at any pretence that it is not doing what, in fact, it *is* doing. In sensual sins, it will act in the very name of the God of nature against His revealed law, and maintain to itself or to others, that it is only fulfilling that for which God made it, and which, being of nature, it cannot help. As though there were no difference between

men and brutes! In matters of faith, the soul will persuade itself that it is doing honour to God, removing human inventions and misinterpretations, and vindicating the attributes of God, His Wisdom or His Justice, His Love or His Tenderness, while it is denying the truth of God. But, in either case, the poison works not the less, because the soul takes it under some other name, and *will* look at the gold-leaf in which she wraps it, and heeds not that it is death.

Both in faith and morals, evil must spread, because it is separated, and separates the soul, from Him Who can alone keep the soul in good. The soul must drift down the stream, since it is cut loose from that which alone would stay it, or could impel it upwards. But even beyond this, evil has a consistency of its own and involves other evil. Every moral evil bears in its bosom further evils, which are its necessary offspring, without which it could not itself be. Each moral evil may at any time demand, as its price, further evil. Sins of the flesh necessarily, besides themselves, involve intense selfishness, injustice, hard-heartedness, deceit; they often issue in what is murder. So as to faith. Faith being one consistent whole, every departure from faith involves inconsistency. The system of truth before rolled around its Centre, God. The withdrawal of one truth disturbs the relations of the whole. The introduction of one error involves the re-adjustment of the whole. The human mind *will*, in the end, be

consistent. Partial error *must* find its consistency in the end, upwards or downwards. On the Rock of truth, or in the abyss! There is no lasting footing between. No heretic abides where he began. He either sees the inherent inconsistency of his own one point of heresy, or others point it out to him. If he is too proud to return, he must plunge deeper. Hence, as a heresy runs its course, it must deny truth which at first it professed to reverence. Hence every heresy seems to degenerate, in that the principles of error which it contains, are evolved. But in truth, it only becomes more consistent with itself. Thus the early Arians believed that Christ our Lord was the Son of God and God, Begotten before the world by the Father, and that by Him all things were created. With this, their heresy, that He was not of the Same Substance with the Father, Co-Equal and Co-Eternal with the Father, was plainly inconsistent. And so they drifted about, making alternately our Lord all but God, or supposing two Gods[o], a primary and a secondary God, and so Polytheists[p], or else avowing their belief that He was a creature, and so Idolaters[q]. Even Socinus began by ascribing worship to Him, to Whom his followers ascribe human error, and (God forgive it!) sinful human passions.

Nestorius acknowledged that our Lord was One

[o] S. Ath. Nic. Def. § 7. p. 63. and note g. Oxf. Tr.

[p] S. Ath. ag. Arians, iii. § 15.16. p. 422. Oxf. Tr. § 64. p. 492.

[q] S. Ath. ag. Ar. i. 8. p. 191. and note d.

Christ, One Son, One Person in two natures[r]; he seemed only to deny that His Mother, when He was born of her, bare God, or Him Who was God. He shrank from confessing the condescension of God, that He did not abhor the Virgin's womb. It might be represented that the whole question lay between the words Θεοτόκος[s] and Χριστοτόκος; "she who bare God" or "she who bare Christ." Later, he saw, that if He Who was born was not God, neither was He after His Birth; not as an Infant[t], not in riper

[r] [S. Paul] "being about [Phil. ii.] to make mention of the Death [of Christ], lest any one should hence suppose that God the Word was Passible, places the word 'Christ,' as a title signifying the Impassible and the Passible Nature in one single Person, so that Christ might safely be called both Impassible and Passible, Impassible in the Godhead, Passible in the nature of the Body." Nestor. Ep. ad S. Cyril in S. Cyril's Epistles, Ep. 5. T. 5. L. 2. p. 26. "In the second head [of S. Cyril] I praise also the distinction of the Natures, according to the Manhood and Godhead, and their conjunction in One Person." Ib. p. 27. "I wish you to hold this firmly. There is no division of the conjunction of dignity, of Sonship; there is no division of the being Christ; but of the Godhead and the Manhood there is a division. Christ, *as* Christ, is Indivisible; for we have not two Christs nor two Sons. For we have not a first and a second; one and another; nor again one and another Son; but One and the Same is twofold, not in dignity but in Nature." Nestor. in S. Cyril adv. Nest. L. 2. T. 6. p. 44. quoted by Petav. de Incarn. 1. 9. 6.

[s] In an ambiguous sense, Nestorius was willing, during the Council of Ephesus, to adopt the word Θεοτόκος, "bare Him Who *became* God," by the conjunction (such as he admitted) with God; if the Church would adopt the word ἀνθρωποτόκος, "bare a man," i. e. a mere man. Serm. 12. Nestorii. § 7-11. in Mercator Op. T. 2. p. 86.

[t] "For not obscure were those things, openly proclaimed in his letters and in his books, and heard outright in his public discourses, and in the very metropolis of the Ephesians openly spoken by him to some of the most pious Bishops. For he ceased not to say: He that was made Man for our sakes ought not to be called God: reproaching the Godhead with the human things, which, not through weakness, but through love for man, It took. Laughing to scorn, as it were, our dread and divine Mystery, he dared to say, when disputing with our most pious Bishops: 'One, two or three months old, I

years. And so he came to hold, that our Lord was purely a Man, like Moses or any other man in whom God should dwell[u]. His heresy had one principle, that God, the All-perfect, could be degraded by His loving-kindness for man; and so he saw that he must deny the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, and became a mere Humanitarian.

Eutyches began with the same principle on the opposite side. He could not persuade himself that our Lord Jesus Christ had a Body of the same sub-

called not God:' and this, three whole days before our holy Synod, as the authentic records testify." Relat. Synod. Eph. ad Imp. P. ii. Act. 1. n. 7. p. 1100. ed. Col.

[u] "As we call the Creator of all things God, and Moses, god; for He saith 'I have made thee a god to Pharaoh;' and [we call] Israel, son of God, for He saith, 'Israel My firstborn;' and as we call Saul, Christ, for He saith, 'I will not lay my hand upon him, for he is the Christ [Anointed] of the Lord;' and Cyrus in like way, 'Thus saith the Lord to my Christ Cyrus, and we call the Babylonians, 'holy' for He saith, 'I command them; they are sanctified, and I lead them;' (Is. 13. 3. lxx.) so we call the Lord also Christ and God and Son and holy: but the community of the names is like; the dignity not the same." Ib. p. 40. The fallacy of Nestorius was, that while he avoided terms which implied or expressed a Personal Union between the Godhead and Manhood in our Lord, he used freely words which expressed a mere "conjunction," "indwelling," as God the Holy Ghost dwells in Christians. He disbelieved an Union between the Godhead and Manhood but, maintaining that our Lord was born a mere man, he supposed that at His Baptism, or some other time, the Godhead descended into Him, and that thus the Manhood was associated with the Godhead, in dignity, will, good-pleasure and the like. He allowed of a conjunction of relation (σχέσις) reference to God (ἀναφορά) indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) operation (ἐνέργεια). He even conceded, in words, a Personal association, (συναφεία κατὰ πρόσωπον) in the sense that Christ was "a common man, born of a woman, who by his growth, and his own human wisdom, made himself worthy of being honoured, and by a connection of person (συναφείᾳ προσώπου) with the Word from God, and in that he was elected according to foreknowledge." S. Cyril de recta fide ad regin. T. v. P. 2. p. 54. see Petav. de Incarn. i. 9. iii. 3. 4. vi. 5. Hence Nestorius held that "Christ was not truly God, but a God-bearing man." ap. S. Cyril adv. Nest. L. 1. p. 10.

stance as our's; but he would approximate as nearly as he could to the true doctrine, by confessing that "the [v] holy Virgin was of the same substance with us, and that of her the Lord was Incarnate." In truth, he did not believe that our Lord took our human nature at all [w], but believed like the Marcionites, a mere phantastic body [x], a nature which, not being our's, was absorbed, he held into the Di-

[v] In Council of Constantinople, A. D. 448. Act. vii. ap. Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. p. 1013, 5. ed. Col. "The Archbishop said, 'Do you not say that He is Consubstantial with the Father as touching His Godhead, and that the Same is Consubstantial with us, as touching His Manhood?' The priest Eutyches said: 'Up to this day I have not said that the Body of our Lord and God is Consubstantial with us, but I confess that the holy Virgin is consubstantial with us, and that our God was Incarnate of her.' Florentius the Patrician said: 'Do you or do you not say, that our Lord Who is of the Virgin is after the Incarnation Consubstantial and of two Natures?' Eutyches the priest said: 'I confess that our Lord was of two Natures before the Union; but after the Union, I confess One Nature.'"

[w] "[Eutyches] said that God the Word took from the Virgin nothing of man, but that being changed without change and becoming flesh (I use his own absurd words) made only a transit through the Virgin, and that the Uncircumscribed and Infinite and Incomprehensible Godhead of the Only-Begotten was nailed and fastened to the Cross, and that This, being committed to the tomb, obtained the Resurrection." Theod. Hæret. Fab. iv. 13.

[x] "Without doubt, as the Holy Spirit has laid open to you, they are associated with the error of the Manichees, who deny that the Only Begotten Son of God took very Man of our nature, and hold that all His bodily actions were those of a feigned phantasm." S. Leo Ep. 59. ad Cler. et Pop. Const. c. 1. p. 976, ed. Ball. "denying that our human nature exists in the Word of God, so that while he revolts at humility in the Majesty of God, he either maintains that Christ had a false shadow of a body, or that all His acts, or bodily affections, belonged to the Godhead rather than to the flesh." Ib. p. 978. "He attempted to persuade the simple, that the Word of God was so 'made Flesh,' that He took not the true flesh of His Mother; nor had a Body of our kind; but that the Nature of His Divinity and Flesh were one: so that he said that our One Lord Jesus Christ was both a false Man and a Passible God. But neither reverence for the faith, nor the nature of the Sacrament admit, either that the Deity was in His Own Nature Passible, or that the Truth lied in taking human nature." Ep. 102. Synod. ad Episc. Gall. c. 3. p. 1138, 9.

vine[y]. But since he denied that our Lord had our human nature, he denied at once both the Incarnation and the Atonement, that our Lord suffered in our human flesh which, in us, had sinned. Nay, had he even seemed to retain this belief, he must either have maintained that the Godhead suffered, or denied that our Lord was God. Thus, beginning, as he thought, in doing honour to God, by exempting Him from contact with our human flesh, he ended

"Asserting that every thing seen, every thing heard, every thing in short, by the testimony of the Gospel, touched and handled in the Only-Begotten Son of God, was not His, Whose it was proved to be, but was of the Substance Co-Eternal and Co-Essential with the Father; as though either the Nature of the Divinity were fixed to the wood of the Cross, or the Unchangeable grew in years, and the Eternal Wisdom increased in wisdom, or God, Who is a Spirit, could be filled with the Spirit." Ep. 120. ad Theodoret § 3. p. 1223. "This profane asserter of a newer sacrilege, confessed indeed the union of the two Natures in Christ, but said that by the very union it was brought about, that of the two one remained, the substance of the other noways existing, which could not in truth be brought to an end, except by being consumed or detached. But these things are so hostile to sound faith, that they cannot be received without the destruction of the Christian Name. For if the Incarnation of the Word be the Union of the Divine and Human Nature, but by this very Union, what was two-fold becomes single, Divinity Alone is born of the Virgin's womb, and, amid a deceitful semblance, It Alone underwent nourishment and bodily increase: and, (to omit all the changes of the human state,) the Divinity Alone was crucified, the Divinity Alone died, the Divinity Alone was buried: so that with them who think such things, there is no reason for hoping for the resurrection, nor is Christ *the First Begotten from the dead* for there was no one to be raised again, if there had been no one who could be killed." Id. Serm. 28. (in Nat. Dom. 8.) c. 5.

[y] Orth. "Tell us what you mean by one Nature after the Union? Is it that the two become one, or that the one remains, the other being destroyed?" Eran. "I say that the Godhead remains, and that the Manhood is absorbed by it." Theod. Dial. 2. p. 114. Orth. "If there can be blending without confusion in bodies, it is clear madness to imagine confusion [of the two Natures] in the Undefiled and Unchangeable Substance, and a destruction of the nature which was taken; the more, since it was taken for the benefit of our race?" Eran. "We do not speak of the destruction of the nature taken but of the change into the Substance of the Godhead." Ib. p. 116.

by holding either that He Who suffered was neither God nor man, or that the Divine Nature Itself suffered, since he supposed the Visible Nature which Christ had, to be really absorbed into the Divine.

Pelagius began with vindicating the glory of God in the power which He had given to man to fulfil His commandment. The listless, easy, undecided lives of ordinary Christians seemed to him a reproach to the power of the Gospel. He ended by denying all grace of God, and reducing it to man's natural powers or the outward law. His next followers believed that our Lord Himself obtained by His mere Human Powers the dignity of becoming the Son of God [z].

These deflections are the more instructive, in that the authors of these heresies were often acute, and still more, some were earnest men. Some even stumbled on their heresies by assailing, with unallowed

[z] This heresy appeared both in Nestorianism and Pelagianism, which also allied themselves together. It followed naturally from the phase of Nestorianism, which supposed the Divine Indwelling to have been bestowed upon our Lord at His Baptism, or after He grew up. It was adopted naturally by the Pelagians, as furnishing them with an instance of One, in Whom their theory of the perfectibility of man might be exemplified. Leporius, who was converted by S. Augustine, owns this of himself. He held that the Man in Christ, "by degrees, as it were, and times, advanced into God, and that He was in one condition before, in another after the Resurrection;" that "by labour, devotion, merits, He attained the end of His Merits;" and "that Christ our Lord so fulfilled all things which belonged to His Sufferings, that in no one was He, as a Perfect Man, helped by the aid of the Divinity; and (he says) I meant so to assign in Christ a Perfect Man, that I might assert that the Word of the Father was free from these sufferings, and I essayed to prove that man, by himself alone, did all these things by the capabilities of mortal nature without any aid of the Deity." Libell. emendat. in App. S. Aug. T. x. p. 127, 8. See also Pet. de Incarn. i. 12.

weapons, an opposite heresy, and fell oftentimes into the very heresy which they at first so vehemently rejected[a]. For since truth is one living whole, it matters not in which part of the body the poison is introduced. One drop spreads through the whole, and the whole faith of the man is dead.

The form of heresy was different; the principle was the same. Man trusted his own conceptions of what a Revelation from God should be, what it were fitting for the Infinite God to do and be, rather than submit blindly to what God had revealed of Himself, that, not trusting in his own light, he might receive pure and unmixed the light from God. Hence they stumbled mostly at that rock of offence, "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness," "the

[a] Arius (although a bad and profane man) fell into his heresy, as a sort of reaction against Sabellianism; Apollinaris into his, which was the parent of so many others, while opposing Arianism; Marcellus into his, against Semi-Arianism. Nestorius began with a fiery zeal against all heretics; and in act against Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, and Quarto-decimans. The services and faith of Eutyches against the heresy of Nestorius were owned in the Council of Constantinople, when he was on trial for his own, (Flavian in Act. iv. Conc. Const. ap. Conc. Chalc. Act. i. p. 990.) and the Council was amazed at the charge. (Ib. p. 934.) Pelagius, on the practical side, began with opposing relaxed notions of a Christian's duty. S. Celestine bears witness in what respect Nestorius was held; "you lived aforetime in such estimation that other cities even envied your people." (Ep. ad Nest. in Conc. Eph. P. i. c. 18. p. 903. ed. Col.) S. Augustine attests that Pelagius was accounted by those who knew him," a good and praiseworthy man," "a holy man and an advanced Christian," "of pure life and praiseworthy manners," &c. (Præf. Bened. ad S. Aug. T. x. p. 2.) Apollinaris was accounted among the most learned of his day; and "thirty books" in defence of the Gospel "against Porphyry, were amongst his most approved works." (S. Jerome de Virr. Ill. c. 104.) Nestorius did not fall into his heresy until after he was Archbishop; Eutyches in extreme age. (Conc. Const. Act. 3. Ib. p. 984.) On the way in which different heresies ran into each other, see Petav. de Inc. L. 1. and notes on S. Ath. ag. Arians p. 189. b. 292. n. 295. o.

Word, God with God, made Flesh." "Having carefully considered," says S. Leo [b], "the opinions of most of those who believe falsely, those too which go headlong to the denial of the Holy Spirit, we learn that no one well-nigh went astray, save such as believed not the truth of two Natures of Christ with the confession of One Person." They denied the Godhead of our Lord, or His Manhood; they who "could[c] not understand the Unity of God except in Unity of Person," held that God dwelt in the Man as His Temple, in a higher degree only than He dwells in Christians; they persuaded themselves that there *could* be a second God, or a Being, not from eternity, who yet was not a creature; they imagined our Lord to be a Being of almost infinite Perfections, or a mere man; or they would exempt Him from the infirmities of human nature; they thought to honour Him by supposing the Godhead to be in place of a soul or a mind; or to have been clad in an ethereal or phantom Nature, or with a fore-existing Body, taking nothing from the Virgin; or that It came into our Lord's Human Body, when already born; or at His Baptism; or that It dwelt in that Body, yet in no close relation to It. In all these ways, man would excuse God, as it were, from the special humility of the Incarnation; but in truth he corrupted his whole faith and knowledge of God. For if man

[b] Serm. 28. [de Nativ. Dom. 8.] c. 4. p. 99.

[c] Ibid. The Sabellians, and probably the Patro-passians, escaped in this way the belief that God the Father suffered.

thinks of God, otherwise than God has revealed Himself, he no longer believes in the true God, i. e. he no longer believes in God at all, but in some idol of his own imagining. Every heresy which has afflicted the Church of Christ has, in some way, impugned the Being of God, as He Is. Even those heresies which do not apparently relate to His Being, either in Himself, or through the way in which our human nature was united to the Divine Person of our Lord, heresies which relate to His Dispensation towards us only, the denial of the place of repentance to the fallen, or of the doctrines of grace, or of the efficacy of the Sacraments ministered by the unworthy, the Novatian, Pelagian or Donatist, did, in fact, represent God as other than He Is.

In these days, most commonly man believes some Attributes of God, such as His Goodness, or His Wisdom, or His General Providence, apart from His Being, as though some Qualities of Almighty God could be the One True Living God!

These grounds from experience, from the very principle and character of faith, from the unity of its Object, and from the analogy of moral duty, are, in truth, but an explanation of the Apostle's declaration, that as there is "One Lord," so there is "one Faith." As there is "One Lord," from Whom the Faith comes, to Whom the Faith leads, so there can be from that One Lord, One only Faith. Faith partakes of the Oneness of Its Author. As the Lord in Whom we believe, is not One and the Same to

those who believe in Him as Very God and Very Man, and to those who think of Him, as either not True God or not True Man; so neither is the Faith one and the same, to those who include opposite and contradictory doctrines within their body of supposed Faith. The "One Faith" which God declares by His Apostle, must be one complete Whole; else it is in no sense, "One." Nor does Holy Scripture know any thing of Revelation except as One Whole. It speaks,[d] not of Faiths but of "*the* Faith," "*the* Faith which is in Christ Jesus;" not of different and varying "truths," but of "*the* Truth;" not of "another Gospel" except to anathematize it, but of "*the* Gospel;" "*the* Word of God," "*the* Word of the Truth of the Gospel," "*the* Word of Christ." Everywhere it implies or asserts, that that which is revealed to our belief, is one indivisible Whole. And this one Whole was proposed, not for questioning, or disputing, or curious argument, or parade of knowledge, but for obedience. "By Whom we have received," S. Paul says, "grace and apostleship for obedience[e] to the Faith." The Apostles received grace and

[d] See Sermon "on the Rule of Faith," p. 11-14. and references.

[e] The meaning of the words is exactly the same, whether *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως* be rendered "for obedience *to* the Faith," or "for obedience *of* faith." "Obedience to the Faith," is expressed in 2 Cor. ix. 13. *ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, "for the subjection of your confession to the Gospel of Christ." But the stress is on the word "obedience." Whether the soul is "obedient to the Faith," i. e. the Revelation of God; or whether "faith" in us "is obedient to God," it is one and the same. The relation to God, expressed is the same; 1. our obedience to what He has revealed to us as matter of faith; or 2. the obedience of our faith to what God has revealed to us.

the mission to teach what God had taught them and they had heard of Him ; and what He taught, *that* we are not to criticise, not to mould after our own pleasure, not to add to, not to take from, but to receive and obey.

But since the entire restoration of man is through entire conformity to the Mind of God, and that conformity is worked in us through entire obedience to His revealed Mind and Will, the very first condition of our restoration is entire self-surrender, and prostration of our whole selves, our imaginations, our minds, our wills, our spiritual conceptions of what is right and fitting, as blind and dark and indistinct and confused, dim guesses, uncertain opinions, floating notions, before the "Light of the Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ." There is no room for conceptions *à priori* of what it is *likely* God would be or do, how He would reveal Himself, how He would continue that Revelation, what creatures He would form, under what conditions He would create them, how He would deal with them, what He would require of them, how (since any relation of the Infinite to the finite must be by some attempering of Himself to His creatures) He would adapt Himself to them, how much of His Infinite Wisdom, Goodness, Holiness, Beauty, Love, He would unfold at once to them. Even human wisdom rejects as unwise in its own sphere of knowledge, the enquiry how things are *likely* to be, when we may know certainly, how they *are.* Such guesses or combinations teach men how

to look, what to observe. When we have the power of observing or analyzing, human reason would reject as absurd and irrational, the attempt to demonstrate how things *must* be. It has been the boast of the "inductive philosophy," to employ theory, only in combination with well-grounded fact, which substantiates the deductions of theory, or furnishes a physical interpretation of mathematical reasoning. Men reject *à priori* notions as to the things with which the powers of their own mind are commensurate, physical science or the mind and will of man, and they think that they may judge *à priori* as to things which the Spirit of God alone can search out or fathom, the Unsearchableness of the Mind of God. It would be thought the extremest rashness to pronounce *à priori* as to man, that he did or did not do this thing, when the facts could be ascertained from certain evidence. It would be accounted a childish waste of time to canvass, from a vague general knowledge of character, what any historical personage *probably* did, when we might know *certainly* what he did. Mental science would not, in human things, be allowed to usurp the province of history; nor our mathematical formulæ to supersede the experiments of physics. *A priori* notions then confessedly are not to be admitted, where there may be certain truth. But to assume that we may not know as certainly the truths of Revelation, as we can those of this world of sense, is to assume that God either cannot, or has not revealed Himself. The truths

which God has revealed of Himself, are the facts as to the Mind and Being and Character of Almighty God, which He provides for us, not to shape, or modify, or explain away, or distort, at our own pleasure, but to bend and conform our own minds to them, and by them to correct our own pre-conceived imaginings as to the Unknown God.

Yet well-nigh every heresy has begun in some *à priori* notion as to God, in Himself or in His ways towards us. And these *à priori* notions have been superficial, as well as impatient and unsubmissive. Instead of thinking "What has God said?" men have said in their hearts, "God *could* not have meant this." They judge beforehand, what *could* or *could not* be the Mind of Almighty God. And what they thus think that God *could* not reveal, that to which their minds are energetically opposed, *that* they *will* not receive. If they can detach it from the Revelation, they will receive the residue, to which they do not object. If they cannot detach it, they reject the whole. But whether they accept or reject the residue, the principle of unsubmission is still the same. They make themselves judges of what is fit for God. They will not allow Him to reveal what they do not like. In vain God says, "My [f] thoughts are not your thoughts; neither are your ways, My ways." They make their own notions the criterion of the Mind of God; not, the revealed Mind of God the corrective of their own thoughts.

All will see this plainly in the Jews and Pagans.

[f] Is. lv. 8.

None will now openly take the part of the Jews against the Prophets or our Lord. In their own time, the false Prophets doubtless had much to say of God's faithfulness to His Promises, of His "Everlasting [g] Covenant;" everlasting [h] ordinances; that He had promised to them their land for "an [i] everlasting possession," that the throne of David should be "established [k] for ever," and that God's "mercy should not depart away from him;" and those who *willed* not to believe God's threats, slew His true Prophets and believed the false. The Jews who would not believe the prophecies, that the Christ would be "despised and rejected of men," fulfilled [l] them by despising, rejecting and condemning Him. The Greeks, to whom it seemed impossible that God should raise the dead, rejected the Gospel, in which was preached Jesus and the Resurrection; they who thought scorn to worship One Crucified, cast it aside as "foolishness." The different tribes of Gnostics or the Manichees did not less oppose themselves to the Mind of God, while they ascribed to the Evil Principle the creation of the world and the origin of matter, because they believed a phantom-Christ and received a mutilated Gospel. *We* have not the temptations of Jews or Gnostics, Manichees or Novatians. The doctrines of the Resurrection or of the creation of matter are as unexplained now, as in the

[g] Gen. xvii. 7.

[h] Ex. xii. 14, 17. xxvii. 21. xxviii. 43. xxx. 21. Lev. iii. 17. vi. 18.

[i] Gen. xvii. 8. xlviii. 4. [k] 2 Sam. vii. 13. 15. [l] Acts iii. 18.

times of the Philosophers of Mars' Hill. Yet it is not the sort of difficulty which weighs upon *our* minds, and so even unsubmissive tempers yield a sort of vague assent to it, or square it to themselves by assuming a resurrection of bodies, yet not the same flesh, or they deny this one doctrine altogether and yet, as they think, believe the Gospel, which the Heathen rejected on the ground of the self-same doctrine.

The phases of human nature change, but our nature itself remains unchanged, except through the Grace of God. The outward form of objection, or opposition, or cavil passes away; the opposition reappears, in substance the same, but wearing the guise and fashion of the times. In difficulties which are not our own, we may see our own temptations. We are in danger, where we sympathise; we see the principle of our own temptation dispassionately, where the error is alien from *our* habit of mind, and suggests no temptation to *us*. The chief temptation of *this* day is not, overtly or wholly to reject Christ. A sort of religion is a necessity of our times. We want a God, Whom we need not think much of while we live, but Who is to make us happy somehow, when we die. We would be on good terms with Him, if we can, but on terms of our own, not His. It satisfies the intellect, to think of a "Supreme Moral Cause;" it ennobles ourselves, to speak of "[m] an endless living,

[m] Œrsted, "the soul in nature," quoted by Prof. Powell, Essays, p. 39.

and acting Reason," whose "laws exist in our" natural "reason" also; it is a resting-place for the mind and intellect to acknowledge "a presiding *Mind*," Whose laws give an unity to all the variations of nature; so that man can escape from acknowledging a supreme *Will*, Whose laws we must obey, Whom we must believe, Whom we must reverence, and Who will punish.

Our temptation is to remove from religion all which is austere, all which is aweful, all which is self-denying, all which shocks our sensitiveness or our taste or our ways of thinking, or which requires a decided submission of our minds, or is at variance with our preconceived notions of God or His Ways of acting,—all in a word, what would not be in a Revelation from God, if we were to make it. And so people light on distinctions, what is to be really matter of Revelation, and what not; they assume that there is a part of Holy Scripture which they may freely criticise, another which they are passively to believe. Or, if they would be respectful to our Lord and His Apostles, they say that He and they "accommodated themselves" to the then prevailing notions in matters which, (it is assumed,) do not affect the centre of religion, i. e. in part they taught the truth of God, in part they countenanced human error. All the while, more consistent thinkers see that the line cannot be distinctly drawn; that the subjects still reserved for Divine faith melt insensibly into those abandoned to human reason, and that

therefore either the claims of human reason must be restricted or the province of Divine Faith must anew be contracted yet more narrowly[n]. Those whose feelings predominate over their intellectual consistency, will ensconce themselves in some nook in the downward descent, believing what they like, and disbelieving what they do not like. Those of keener intellects see the inconsistency still unremoved at each step of the descent, descend lower and lower in the hope of finding some standing-ground, and find none, until they say, "There is no God." For since One is the God of Nature and of Grace; One the God of the Old Testament and the New, of Nature and Grace; and since the books of both all bear the impress of His One Hand, whatever is objected to in any one part, vibrates in fact through the whole scheme of God's Providence and Revelation; and what is out of harmony with any one part, is in fact out of harmony with all.

One, overwhelming, heavy, impenetrable, cloud, *does* weigh on all which we see of God's creation; a cloud, which we cannot remove, cannot lighten, cannot understand in this world, and which probably none will understand, save those who shall read the meaning of the mystery in the Face of the Living God. The mystery of evil in the works of God, Almighty, All-Wise, and All-Good, can neither be explained, nor softened, on any system of religion or

[n] Phasesof Faith, p. 82, 3. 111-15. 144.

irreligion. For Pantheism, besides its other absurdities, has this above all, that it avoids admitting that God permits evil, by making Him the Actor of all evil. In the Pantheistic system, whatever sin is committed, it is God Himself who sins [o].

But since the existence of evil in the works of God is wholly beyond reason, and yet we must believe in the Infinite Love and Goodness of our God, although we cannot in the least understand, why He Who is All-Good should have created that which He knew would become evil, then it were against reason to require as a condition of our belief, that we should understand any thing bound up with the existence of that evil. Since we are wholly ignorant about the whole, it were childish to insist that we should fully understand a part [p]. If we understand not some law impressed by God on His Natural Creation we do not require to understand any thing depending upon that law. Since we understand not the connection of our souls and bodies, we do not refuse to believe that we have souls, because we cannot explain some result of that connection. Since we cannot, in any the least act of choice in

[o] See S. Augustine in Note on the Manichees at the end of his Confessions, p. 323. and Conf. iv. 26. p. 61. This belief that the sinful acts of man are, in fact, the acts of the Deity of whom the soul is held to be a part, has been found by our Missionaries in India to deaden the conscience of the common Hindoo and to hinder conversion. Add Conf. v. § 18. p. 78. viii. § 22.

[p] The appeal, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest unto God?" is not an "inference of Wisdom from Power, i. e. that Might makes Right," (Phases of Faith, p. 75.) but a denial of the right of human ignorance to impugn Divine Wisdom or Justice.

this life, reconcile God's Knowledge and our free-will, we are content to leave Predestination, as a Mystery which need not be cleared to us. We do not become fatalists, because we cannot reconcile the fact of our free-will with the absolute Knowledge of God. Were any consistent fatalist to act on the denial of his own free-will and his own responsibility, his fellows would be compelled, in self-defence, to confine him as a lunatic or a malefactor. And yet, in the abstract, they could not solve his difficulty. Since we cannot understand how God created out of nothing, we cannot, in reason, require to understand in any part, whatever is involved in the Mystery of Creation. Since we must believe that, having in all eternity existed without Creating, God, without change in Himself, did what He did not before, no *à priori* objection can be raised against any seeming change in Divine Revelation. Since the very mode of God's Being, as a Spirit, is wholly unknown to us, and we cannot even picture to ourselves any mere Spirit, much less the Being of God, Who is Wholly every where, but the Whole of Him no where, it were the extremest folly and inconsistency to object that, to be Three in One is contradictory [q] in *His* Mode of Existence, of Which we know nothing. Since the existence of an Infinite Eternity before all creation was, is wholly beyond our thought, and in vain we go back and back and

[q] Phases of Faith, p. 48, 88.

back to find a Beginning to that which had no Beginning, and we must needs speak of Eternity backwards under the image of past time, *then* it is nothing inconsistent to speak of God the Son, as "[r] Begotten from everlasting of the Father," in order to express that in His Eternal Unchangeable Being, He Is Ever Begotten by the Father, and never was time when He was not. Since we can know nothing, except by experience, of the way in which God speaks to the soul, to argue that those to whom He revealed Himself, had no certain criterion[s] by which they could recognize that it was He Who spake, is to limit Divine Wisdom and Power on the ground of a man's own ignorance, much as though one denied the reality of a language which one's self knew not. And so, since the existence of evil is absolutely inexplicable, then it is an unreasonable cavil to except against the extermination of the Canaanites, or the eternity of punishment, or any doctrine of the Atonement,[t] as contrary to the Attributes

[r] "To me it seemed a most unworthy shuffling with words to say that the Son was begotten, but was never begotten. The very form of our past participle is invented to indicate an event in past time." Phases of Faith, p. 84. Not in past *time* certainly. All our phrases as to eternity must involve imperfection. Scripture says, "from everlasting to everlasting," "Whose Goings forth have been of old *from* everlasting." But "from everlasting" is an inadequate expression; since in Eternity there is no point *from* which to begin. "Begotten from everlasting" contradicts the Arian heresy that the Son had a Beginning. One human phrase cannot express all sides of Divine Truth, that the Relation of the Father and the Son is One Unceasing Relation; not an Act, but an Eternal, Unchangeable *Fact* in the Divine Essence. See S. Ath. against Arians, i. § 14. p. 201. and note b. Oxf. Tr.

[s] Phases of Faith, p. 176, 7. 181. 148-151. The last reference extends to our Lord Himself. [t] See Note A. at the end; Phases of Faith, p. 92.

of God. For since we cannot in the least understand, how the existence of evil at all is reconcileable with the Attributes of God, plainly we cannot understand what is a part and consequence of what we understand not.

Rather as to all these and the like questions, we might say; explain to me the Mystery on which your objection hangs, and I will explain to you the wisdom of that to which you object. Explain to me the Mode of God's Being as a Spirit, and I will explain to you, how God is Three in One; explain to me the Essence of God, and I will explain to you how that Essence is eternally communicated by the Father to the Son, and, through the Son, to the Holy Ghost, and how the Three Divine Persons eternally In-exist in One Another. Explain to me "Unde malum," how the existence of evil at all is consistent with the Infinite Wisdom and Power and Love of God; and I will explain to you the Justice of eternal punishment. Explain to me His Justice and Love in the sufferings of the new-born infant, and I will explain to you how and why the Justice of God required that the Innocent should bear the guilt of us sinners, and it pleased the Lord to lay upon Him the iniquities of us all. Explain to me the Mode of the Knowledge of God, and I will explain to you our own free agency and the mystery of Predestination and of the efficacy of prayer. Explain to me the Act whereby God created out of nothing, and I will unfold to you all the mysteries of

creation. Explain to me the nature of the spiritual body after the Resurrection, and I will explain to you, how this same flesh shall arise. Make known to me how the soul dwells in the body, and I will explain to you how God the Holy Ghost dwells in the soul. Make clear to me how "the reasonable soul and flesh is one man," and I will make clear to you, how "God and Man are One Christ[u]." Lay open to me how God by His ordinary Grace acts upon the soul, and I will make clear to you how God made known to Abraham,[v] that it was He Who bade him offer up his son. Make known to me, whence and how those lightning thoughts come, which flash into our minds, kindle our hearts, enlighten our souls, are *in* and not *of* us, and yet are attempered to the characters of each of us, and I will explain to you how God the Holy Ghost inspired Apostles, led them into the whole truth, spake in them, yet suggested the thoughts which He gave to each, in forms adapted to the mind of each. Shew me how we can fully, definitely, accurately, comprehend a thought without words, and then require me to believe that He

[u] Athan. Creed. Strauss denied this on the mere ground that it could not be understood. "Whether Person be an abiding oneness of life, Nature, or the complex of laws according to which the conditions of life have their course, *it is inconceivable* how two, so thoroughly different, systems of conditions of life *can* coincide in one centre." (quoted by Dr. Mill, Pantheistic principles p. 28.) The statement of the difficulty shows how little Strauss understood the very belief which he criticised. The illustration, in the Athanasian Creed (like all illustrations) must be imperfect, in that the soul and body are parts of one nature, not, as the Godhead and Manhood in our Lord, two Natures. But if we cannot understand the less, how much less the greater!

[v] Phases of faith p. 150. &c.

Who promised that God the Holy Ghost should lead the Apostles "into the whole truth," and should "speak in" them, inspired the Apostles without words, and call on me to deny verbal inspiration. Explain to me the different spiritual conditions and natural tempers and trials of children of the same parents, and I will explain to you the partialness of the Divine Revelation.

But if, in all these and many more things, we know the *that*, rather than the *how* or the *why;* if, as to our very earthly lives and the daily functions of our bodies and our souls, God has given us full practical knowledge, but has kept from us the hidden springs, and we know not what is the principle of our life, what is sleep, or why it refreshes us, how the nerves communicate their sensations, how we see, what is our memory, or our imaginations, and whereon they depend; what folly and madness to act in Divine things and in what concerns the soul, as we should not in human, which much concern us!

"It is a main characteristic," we are told, "of sound (physical) philosophy, that it draws the line precisely between the known and unknown;" that having once grasped firmly a great principle, we should be satisfied to leave minor difficulties to wait their solution; that we must not assume a physical phenomenon to be inexplicable, because *we* cannot explain it.[v] The confession of human ig-

[v] See Prof. Powell Essays. p. 106. 94. sqq. 155. sqq. see Note B. at the end.

norance is rightly urged in defence of the results of human science. In human science too we must not argue against the legitimate inferences from what we know. It is matter of faith, that there can be no place for chance or necessity in the works of God: it is a contradiction to conceive that His works do not bear on them the impress of the Unity of their Creator. Doubtless, if we could grasp it, the physical creation is one great Whole, reflecting, in its order and harmony, the One Mind Which formed it: the least things as well as the greatest, the foul and the beautiful, the seeming anomaly as well as the rule, the useless (as it would seem) or the noxious as well as those things whose uses are most obvious; things which seem to contradict God's Will as well as those which directly fulfil it, obeying His Word and accomplishing that for which He made them. Nay more, it has often been by believing a truth of nature, notwithstanding surrounding difficulties and adverse phænomena, that successive generations of students of natural truth have come to see its full bearings and evidence.

So also, by and upon believing, we see some portion of the reasonableness of mysteries which are beyond our reason, or the unreasonableness of objections, or the harmony between distant truths. Superficial reason has scoffed at the Mystery of the Trinity and of the lowliness of the Incarnation. To faith, the Mystery of the Trinity lays open, as

far as may be, the adequate Bliss of Almighty God in all eternity, how He Who Is Infinite Wisdom and Infinite Love had within Himself the adequate Object of His Wisdom and His Love. He, Love Infinite, exists in, contains, Is One with, loves with His Whole Infinite Being, Co-Equal Co-Eternal Love. To superficial reason, the Incarnation has seemed a thing incredible. To faith it seems more reasonable that God, having vouchsafed to make intelligent creatures capable of His Love, did not keep them apart from Himself, to adore only and admire and love Him from without, but that He united them to Himself by the closest union which was possible between the creature and the Creator, and, having taken the Manhood into God, "gathered [x] together in One all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, *in Him* in Whom we also have obtained an Inheritance."

And so too faith is, with reason, assured, that what is not yet made clear to it, will, when we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, reflect the Glory and Wisdom of God. Some things it sees, which once it could not discern. And so, the more cheerfully it trusts those other truths with its God; sure, that those far-distant nebules, which still hang in the midst of the starry sky of God's Revelation, in unwonted unexplained forms, will, when his eye shall be strengthened to behold their structure, re-

[x] Eph. i. 10. 11.

solve themselves into glorious suns, irradiating, with Light from God, those distant and darker parts of the system of Divine Wisdom, which now we cannot bear to look upon.

Meanwhile, one Unfailing Light there ever is in our remaining darkness, to Which if we cleave, our darkness will be light around us. Truths of God wear a very different aspect, as we scrutinize, speculate, theorize, criticise, or as we love, adore, reverence, hearken, obey. In criticising, men stand, as it were, without and above God's Word; they handle it, as a thing subject to them; they tell over its syllables, arrange its words, analyse its construction; but never will they catch its meaning. As they look into it, so it will look to them. They insert their own meaning into it; they do not read out of it the Mind of God. Such busy themselves with a letter, to them dead. They think not of it as the Voice of God; and that Voice, which reaches all who hearken to It, is silent to unheeding ears.

But to those who *will* hearken, Jesus, our Saviour and our God, still lives and speaks, hushes, assures, calms the soul. Faith does not "admire" or "praise," as if it were yielding some testimony of its own to the Perfection of its Redeemer. Criticism *must* misjudge, because He is no Object of criticism. "I receive not," He said, "honour from men." He came not to gain honour, but to bestow it. If we go to Jesus otherwise than as little children to learn of Him, we mistake our own relation to Him, as His

creatures; we should already in our hearts disown Him, as our Divine Master. Whether in matters of faith or practice, we must submit ourselves to Him without reserve. We must not "hold back part of the price." "If Baal be God, then follow him; but if the Lord be God, then follow Him." The difficulties as to faith are well-nigh over, if with an entire, whole-hearted, loyal devotion, without reserves, without dread of consequences, without thought that this or that will not be popular with the philosophers or the friends of advancement, or that it may frighten back half-believers, we resign ourselves to believe, submit to, obey, do, whatever is the revealed Mind of God. The battle of faith was never won by half-heartedness. Only fix steadfastly in thy heart what God Is, and what thou. He, the All-Wise, the All-Good, Who out of nothing made thee for Himself, Who, for thy good alone, reveals Himself to thee, to Whom thou belongest by every right, because He made thee, He redeemed thee, He would sanctify thee, that thou shouldest be His for ever, shouldest partake of all which is His, His Wisdom, His Love, His Goodness, His Glory, His Beauty; and, if His Infinity must be withheld from His creatures, it is but that thou shouldest never come to an end of the stores of His Good, because they are Infinite. And we, what are we? His creatures, who can only think, while He gives us power to think; who can only will, because He endows us with, and maintains us

in, that power to will; who live the life of the flesh, through His Gift, and if we have a spiritual life, through His Life in our souls. And what are we then, that we should make terms with Him, what, or how much we shall believe, what we *can* receive, what it were fitting for Him to declare? "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth," is the only fitting voice of the creature to the Creator. So speak to Him, without reserve; yield thyself wholly to Him, as clay to the potter, not to mould His Words, but that His Words may re-mould thee; surrender thyself to Him for time and for Eternity, for the very least as for the greatest, to learn of Him all which He will teach. Listen to the Words of Jesus, and let not Him be as a stranger[p] to thee, and thou wilt find, that the Office of God the Holy Ghost has not ceased in the Church, that He will still guide into the whole Truth those who will indeed be Christ's disciples, and will learn of Him; thou wilt still find thy "heart burn within" thee, while, in His words which He spake on earth, Jesus will still speak to thee by the way; thou shalt know with a knowledge above demonstration, proof against cavil, certain as sight, unshaken as the Living Rock in Whom thou hast believed. For He has said, "They shall be all taught of God."

[p] "My historical conception of Jesus had so gradually melted into dimness that He had receded out of my practical religion, I knew not exactly when." Phases of Faith p. 188, 9.

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." Whom should we follow, save Thee, since Thou hast, Thou art, Thou in Thy Faithfulness and Mercy wilt give, the Life which Thou hast promised? Thou Thyself art the Truth; the Unerring Way unto Thyself the Life, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, One God, Blessed, and blessed-making for evermore.

Thanks be to God.

NOTES TO SERMON II.

Note A.

Mr. Jowett's objections to the doctrine of the Atonement have their whole force from his implying that they would involve human passions in God. (Doctrine of the Atonement p. 472.) He ignores that our Lord Himself speaks of God the Father as giving His Only-Begotten Son (S. John iii. 16.) as a special act of Love for man. (comp. Tit. iii. 4. 5.) Mr Jowett specifically excepts to the idea, "that there were 'some impossibilities in the nature of things' which prevented God from doing other than He did." Thus (he says) "we introduce a moral principle superior to God, just as in the Grecian mythology fate and necessity are superior to Jupiter." (Ib.) The meaning of the words, "that there was an impossibility in the nature of things," would be expressed more accurately, that "it might have involved a contradiction to the Divine Nature." All the Acts of God are obviously the result of the Divine Mind, as human acts are the result of the human mind. Since then, God is Infinitely Wise, Holy, and Good, we know that whatever He has done is the result of His Wisdom, Holiness, and Goodness; and, consequently, that it would not have been equally consistent with His Wisdom, Holiness, and Goodness, to have done otherwise.

It is impossible even to guess what in Mr. Jowett's mind lies under the vague language, which he substitutes for the doctrine of the Atonement. (p. 480-2.)

Having formally rejected the doctrine that our Lord's Death was a "Satisfaction" for our sins, or, in any real sense "a Sacrifice for our sins," which is so explicitly taught by the Church of England[a] also, Mr Jowett attempts to substitute an "explanation of the doctrine of the Atonement" such as "nature and Scripture, and the still small voice of Christian feeling (as he thinks) give."

1. "Every where S. Paul speaks of the Christian as one with Christ. This union with Him is a union not in His Death merely, but in all the stages of His Existence: living with Him, suffering with Him, dying with Him, crucified with Him, buried with Him, rising again with Him, renewed in His image, glorified together with Him —these are the expressions by which this union is denoted. There is enough here for faith to feed on, without sullying the mirror of God's Justice, or overclouding His Truth: peace and consolation enough without raising a suspicion which secretly destroys peace."

It is, of course, true that Holy Scripture tells us, that the Merits of Christ's Death are imparted to us, that we are made partakers both of His Death and of His Life,

[a] "One Christ, Very God and Very Man, Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a Sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for the sins of men." Art. ii. "The Offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and *Satisfaction* for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other *Satisfaction* for sin, but That alone." Art. xxxi. "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Who of Thy tender Mercy didst give Thine Only Son Jesus Christ to suffer Death upon the Cross for our Redemption, Who made there, by His One Oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and *Satisfaction*, for the sins of the whole world." Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Holy Communion. "That Thy bountiful help and mercy may speedily help and deliver us through the *Satisfaction* of Thy Son our Lord." Collect for the fourth Sunday in Advent.

that we are mystically united with Christ. But this truth in no way supersedes, nor is any explanation of the passages in which our Lord and His Inspired Apostles tell us, that He died for us.

II. That we need an assurance that "when the grave covers us, there is a God to Whom we still live. This assurance is given to us by the life and death of Christ. *Not* the sacrifice, *not* the satisfaction, *not* the ransom, but the greatest moral act done in the world,—the act of one in our likeness—is the assurance to us that God in Christ is reconciled to the world." Our Lord's Death *for* us *is* such an assurance. But in itself, the "greatest moral act done in this world by one in our likeness" would only show, that there was one Being "in our likeness" with Whom God was well-pleased. The perfect Holiness of Christ would not make us less sinners, or children of wrath, had He been only "One in our likeness," unless His Holiness had removed the guilt of our unholiness, His Innocence had effaced our sinfulness. This it has done, since He "is[b] the Mediator between God and man, Who gave Himself a Ransom for all." Our Lord Himself insists, not on the Act alone, but on its Vicariousness: "The[c] Son of man came to give His Life a Ransom for many."

III. "We are all unprofitable servants, even the best of us." But we have this "true sense of man's unprofitableness accompanied also by an unshaken confidence in the mercy of God. No account can be given of the confidence." An account *can* be given of it, and *is* given of it by every simple Christian, who can say with the Apostle, "I live by faith in the Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself for me." But this trust, which, if well-founded, is the fruit of our reconciliation with God through faith

[b] 1 Tim. ii. 5. 6. [c] S. Matt. xx. 28.

in the Blood of Christ, cannot stand as an account of the Atonement. They who believe that God has, for Christ's sake, forgiven them, have a ground of assured peace, notwithstanding their own unworthiness. It must be a miserable condition in which we should be left on Mr. Jowett's theory. "He who has this confidence finds the reasons of it desert him, the moment he begins to consider them." (p. 481.)

Mr. Jowett sums up; IV. "There is more in the Life and Death of Christ than we pretend to fathom. Definite statements respecting the relation of Christ, either to God or man, are but human figures transferred to a subject which is beyond speech and thought." All the truths of Revelation *are* "beyond speech and thought;" but in their depth and fulness, not in their meaning; else it were no Revelation at all. We do not understand *how* the Father and the Son Exist in the Eternal Relation of the Father and Son: but we do know *that* such Is Their Eternal Being. So also as to the Very Being of God. We cannot understand His Being, Infinity, Eternity, Omnipresence, Omniscience. We could not understand them, unless we ourselves were God. But we *can* understand, that God *Is* Omnipresent, Omniscient, Eternal, Infinite, although we can understand "in part" only, how much those words Eternal, Infinite, contain. We *can* know, for instance, "God Is in this place"; and, since God Is Indivisible, we *can* know that He is in this place, in all His Majesty and Glory, (if we could but behold Him.) Only, *how* the Infinite God can be wholly in one place, we know not. So as to every truth of God. Without "definite statements" we know nothing. A statement, which is not definite, has *no* meaning at all. A "definite statement" implies that we have some knowledge, not that we have all. "God is a Spirit," is a definite statement,

although we know not what "Spirit" is, save that it is not material. So also they are "definite" truths, that "God sent His Son to be the Propitiation for our sins;" that "He made His Soul to be an Offering for sin;" "He was bruised for our iniquities;" "while enemies, we were reconciled to God by the Death of His Son;" "the Lord laid upon Him the iniquities of us all;" "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." Our Lord's Vicarious Sufferings, that He bore the penalty of our sins, which was due to us, and that our sins are forgiven us, because "He bare them for us," are clear definite truths, although we cannot understand the depth, either of the Holiness or the Justice or the Love of God. But a statement, which is not definite, is, in fact, no positive statement or truth at all. It is to give us a shadow, instead of the substance of truth.

Mr. Jowett admits (p. 475, 6.) that the Apostles, in this, spake as Jews. "They remained so [Jews] after their conversion in their thoughts and language." He admits that they taught the doctrine of the Atonement, as we believe it. If this, being the very Centre of the Gospel, had not been true, neither could we depend upon them in any thing else. No consistent minds will ever occupy such ground as this. They must go on to full unbelief, or they must return to definite faith.

Note B.

I cannot quote Professor Powell's work, without expressing a hope that the Rev. Professor will make out more clearly, where his theory on the absolute Uniformity of Nature, and on Causation (Essay i. §. iii. iv.) leaves room for miracles. The answer is easy, if he can give it, that no theory as to God's ordinary workings interferes with the belief, that He, whensoever He Wills, suspends that

mode of working. By the constant operation of His Will, He now upholdeth all things by an uniform law; at His Will, by which He ordinarily continues that law, He acts otherwise when it seemeth Him good. Prof. Powell alludes in one place to a theory as to miracles, that "instead of interruptions, they are really to be regarded rather as instances of some more comprehensive laws unknown to us"; but apparently, only to lay it aside. (p. 473. sqq.) All such theories represent God as a Great Architect, as it were, of the Universe, Who, when He had finished His work, left it to stand independent of Himself. They exclude His Providence, as much as His Miraculous Working. Prof. Powell gives no statement of his own. Scientific writers, even if Clergymen, need not introduce Theology; but at least, a Christian is bound, not to exhibit a theory which would obviously involve a negation of miracles, without explaining in what way it does not (as, if true, it cannot) exclude them. Prof. Powell asserts, but does not prove, that the results of Geology are inconsistent with the truth of the account of the Creation in the Book of Genesis.

PATIENCE AND CONFIDENCE

THE

STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH.

A SERMON

PREACHED

ON THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER,

1837,

BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

AT ST. MARY'S.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. *Isaiah* xxx. 15.

FOURTH THOUSAND.

SOLD BY

JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER, OXFORD,

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON;

J. AND F. H. RIVINGTON, LONDON,

41, HIGH STREET, OXFORD, AND 19, TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE.

1864.

PLYMOUTH:
PRINTED AT THE PRINTING PRESS OF THE DEVONPORT SOCIETY.
1861.

TO THE

REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF POETRY, AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL,

WHO IN YEARS PAST

UNCONSCIOUSLY IMPLANTED A TRUTH

WHICH WAS AFTERWARDS TO TAKE ROOT,

HIMSELF THE DUTIFUL DISCIPLE

OF ITS ANTIENT GUARDIAN AND FAITHFUL WITNESS

IN WORD AND ACTION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

THIS SERMON

IS INSCRIBED WITH EVERY FEELING

OF RESPECTFUL AND AFFECTIONATE GRATITUDE

FOR THIS AND MANY OTHER BENEFITS.

Exod. xiv. 13.

Fear ye not, stand still, and see the Salvation of the Lord, which He will shew to you to-day.

The history of the Old Testament is the sun of all other history, Christian or profane. In it the cloud, which veils the mercy-seat as well as the pathways of Divine Providence, is withdrawn, and the light from behind the cloud flashes through, the token of the Divine presence to those who can behold it, light to His people, although to the Egyptians darkness. So marked, indeed, is the analogy of the kingdoms of unseen and revealed Providence, that men must acknowledge it one way or the other. Unless they trace it where it is less distinct, they will lose sight of it where it is most clear. Unless they explain what is less known by what is declared, they will explain away what is declared by what is obscure. Unless they make use of the light given them where they might see, it will be withdrawn from them where they think they see. Twilight, in that it has a portion of light, has a correspondence with day-break; and whoso, when the light is come, will not explain the indistinct outlines which he saw, "men as trees, walking," by the distincter and revealed forms which he now beholds, must go on to walk in the darkness which he loves rather than light. They who interpret not what men call nature

by the Bible, will bring down the Bible to the standard of nature.

This has been done of old times. This very history of the passage of the Red sea, Josephus, it has been wisely noticed, "in his worst spirit of compromise," compared to an escape of Alexander; and the modern historian of the Jews, who, with a righteous indignation, censured Josephus, was himself much to be blamed for the like parallels; and what was in his case rightly condemned, was, in another form, circulated as religious teaching[a]. Whoso, again, will not recognise the finger of God in His providential cures, will not see it in His miraculous agency. They who resolve every thing into secondary or physical causes in the one case, and will not see Him Who is the Cause of all causes, and worketh by all those things whose operation meets our senses, will lose all sense for discerning His hand, where Scripture plainly declares it. When men had explained away, as the *mere* effects of imagination, cures in modern times, out of the wonted order of God's Providence, which, though no confirmation of a religious system, seem to have been personal rewards to strong personal faith, they were ready to apply the same principle to many of the miracles of the Gospel.

[a] These cases are adduced, not to censure the individuals;—the error was not theirs only, it is that of their age;—but to illustrate the exceeding liability to such error, whenever the attempt is made to interest people in the Bible, on the current principles of ordinary life, to make the characters of the Bible interesting any how to persons of any stamp. The Society alluded to corrected its work, yet it is instructive, that a Society in high repute should have fallen into the error, which had recently been so strongly condemned. It too was attempting to keep pace with the times, and to conciliate half-believers.

When they had altogether ceased to see in any derangement of the faculties, a power permitted to evil spirits, they were prepared and did, as soon as it was suggested, deny it in the dæmoniacs of the New Testament[b]. And so, again, one may see the evil of a class of illustration, derived from the Arminian school, whereby all sorts of heathen sayings are brought into parallel with Gospel teaching. So soon as they ceased to be regarded as the seeds of truth which the Divine Word had scattered among the Heathen, (as way-marks and finger-posts, looking on to something to come, and requiring correction and developement,) and were viewed as something independent and substantial, they were used as interpreters, or critics, or rivals, of Gospel truth. The words of inspiration again are glowing language, such as in human compositions is poetry; but whoso looked upon the Hebrew prophets as poets, for-

[b] A controversy on this subject, which led to the disbelief of the actual "possessions" in the New Testament, was confessedly the commencement of German rationalism. It is not meant, by the above, to assert positively that *all* insanity is the effort of dæmoniacal agency; (Scripture distinguishes sometimes σεληνιαζόμενοι from δαιμονιζόμενοι;) but only to protest against the arbitrary limitation of that agency to the Gospel period. Church history directly proves its continuance beyond that period; thoughtful and reverent observation will leave no doubt, that much termed insanity, (as in the case of many suicides, but also in others,) is in fact Satanic re-*possession* of the house which had been "swept and garnished." Our popular and poetic language, in its use of the word "possest," "what possesses him?" bears testimony to the former belief, and even, in our present use, shews that we acknowledge a phænomenon higher than we can explain. We speak thus of persons, (to say the least,) as not being under their own control, being driven about by some agency within them, impelled to acts, which, if they were their own masters, they would not do. Other languages express this even more plainly; and it is expressed more or less forcibly in all modern languages, e. g. *Fr.* possédé; *Ital.* ossesso, invasato; *Span. Port.* possesso; *Germ.* besitzen, besitzung, besessener; and so in others. Popular language is more philosophical and truer than scientific.

got that they were the awful messengers of the Most High. They who measured by earthly principles the actions of God's instruments, lost sight, Whose they were, and Whom they served. He who illustrated the law given by Moses, upon the principles of ordinary legislation[c], undermined in his people the belief that it was divine. Apologists, accordingly, in every department, have substituted a human counterfeit for the Divine reality, by illustrations, by defending (as they deemed) divine truths on human principles, by explaining "hard sayings" through the commonplaces of ordinary morality, the justice of God by the expediency of men: and on this ground, there has (as a fact) been no more fruitful source of heresy or unbelief, than defences of the faith.

In history, morals, poetry, legislation, philosophy, language, physics, religion,—Heaven and Earth, a body of clay and a spirit breathed into its nostrils by the life-giving Spirit, stand over against each other, and whoso lifteth not up the earthly to the heavenly, will bring down the heavenly to the earthly. "Homer," says even a heathen[d], "transferred human things to the gods; would he had rather things divine to man!" If the body be not spiritualized, the soul will be carnalized.

The light then of all history is God's uidance, dim

[c] J. D. Michaelis on the laws of Moses; a book which uniformly exhibits things on the lowest and most commonplace side, setting out on the assumption, that Moses was an ordinary legislator.

[d] Cicero, Tusc. i. c. 26. Fingebat hæc Homerus, et humana ad Deos transferebat; divina mallem ad nos.

indeed often, and overlaid by the intricacy of human policy and craftiness, yet still visible to those who in the detail of the workmanship forget not the Maker, nor allow themselves by the study of the visible creature to be held down from beholding the Invisible. Even in Heathen empires He declares by His prophets, that "*He* changeth the times and the seasons: *He* removeth kings, and setteth up kings[e]." Even there, among those who seem to rule, He is the One Ruler. "The Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men," (an unseen power *within* man's visible kingdom, permitting or withholding, uniting or dissolving, giving strength or bringing age upon them, and directing man's free agency, like the wild uproar of the sea, to His own ends, unseen by man His work, but ever present with and *within* His work,) "the Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will[f]." Pharaoh, Cyrus, the "Assyrian, the rod of His anger[g]," but "who meant not so, neither did his heart think so[h]," Nebuchadnezzar, of whom God saith by Jeremiah, "*I* have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground,—and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto Me, and now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, My servant,—and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of *his* land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him[i]"—these are but so many specimens and instances

[e] Dan. i. 21. [f] Ib. iv. 25. [g] Isaiah x. 5. [h] Ver. 7. [i] Jer. xxvii. 5—7.

of His universal empire, doing all that is good, and ordering what is evil, so that "the wrath of man doth but praise Him[k]."

And this should be understood not simply of certain fixed laws, whereby the rise and decay of states are regulated, as that an enduring self-denying state should prosper, a luxurious self-indulgent people should decay, an upright state should acquire might, a crafty (like Carthage) should be taken in its own craftiness, and the like. God is not separate from His Providence and His laws, nor is His law an abstraction, to which He has committed the government of things; rather, His laws are His own continued action, dispensing in one *uniform* way His sovereign will, because "in Him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." In all He Himself acteth, personally present and personally measuring out to every nation its portion according to its works, by His own Will, Whose will is the law of things created. For so doth Scripture, speaking of all his doings every where, speak of His Personal acting. "With Him," it is written in Job[l], "is strength and wisdom, the deceived and the deceiver are His: He leadeth counsellors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools: He looseth the bond of kings, and girdeth their loins with a girdle: He leadeth princes away spoiled, and overthroweth the mighty: He removeth away the speech of the trusty, and taketh away the understanding of the aged; He poureth contempt upon princes, and weakeneth

[k] Ps. lxxvi. 10. [l] Chap. xii. 16-21. 24.

the strength of the mighty :—He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way." Nay it seems to be one object of the relations of the Old Testament to correct man's Atheistic way of contemplating things, whereby he would substitute for the Living God some abstraction, as law, or nature, or general Providence, or order of things, for the Giver and Maintainer of laws and nature, "the Lord Who will provide" and order all things. And therefore, it may be, doth God, in this place of Job and elsewhere, speak in such detail and so vividly, shewing that not only the ends but the means, not only the victory but the strength, not the power to persuade, but eloquent speech and the understanding of the experienced, are His, that He giveth or withholdeth, turneth them to foolishness or taketh them away, as He will. Not the great results only, (as men call great,) but the smallest, most insignificant means, every step of the countless multitudes who march along the high-way of God's Providence, is ordered by Him, so that they should "march[m] every one on his ways, and not break their ranks, neither one thrust another, but walk every one in his path." And hence God's saints so often in holy Scripture confess, that all their power and wisdom and might cometh from Him, not in general terms only, but in particulars. It is He "Who girdeth[n] them with strength," giveth swiftness

[m] Joel ii. 7, 8. [n] Ps. xviii. 32.

to their feet[o], "maketh them wiser than the aged[p]," "teacheth their hands to war[q]." For this faith in God's aid and in His presence in details is the life of all belief in His general Providence; and, without this, that more general belief is little better than an empty abstraction.

But if the history of God's dealing with the Jewish Church is a key to His governance of that His larger family, who had "gone away into a far country[r]," to follow their own desires uncontrolled, much more is it to His governance of the Christian Church. For here we have not only the general correspondence of God's sovereignty, whereby the creatures of God's hands must, either willingly or against their will, be under His rule, must bear the sceptre or the rod of iron, and carry on His ends in their preservation or destruction, by their obedience or their perverseness. We have the happier lot of being His family, the kingdom which He has chosen out of all nations to dwell in them. The Theocracy is continued, only invisibly. As God dwelt before by the Shechinah in the temple, so now the universal Christian Church is one temple, wherein it pleaseth Him to dwell, not now for a time—but "the Lord will abide in it for ever," by virtue of His own promise, "Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

We must not think of the law or its blessings as passed away. Our Lord forbids it. What does not

[o] Ps. xviii. 33. [p] Ibid. cxix. 100. [q] Ibid. xviii. 34. [r] S. Luke xv. 13.

yet remain, is *ful*filled, *i. e.* filled up as an outline by the substance. The moral law remains. The ritual and the political had their fulfilment in Christ and His Church. The particular Providence over the Jewish people continues on in the Christian Church; only in the Christian, higher far and more enduring, as the spiritual is higher than the civil Government, the relation of sons than that of servants, Heaven than Canaan. "The whole kingdom of the Hebrew nation," says S. Augustine[s], "was one great prophet, because it prophesies of one Great One. In the actions as well as the words of their holy men must we look for prophecies of Christ *and His Church;* but, for the rest of the nation, collectively, in *God's dealings with them.* 'For all these things (as the Apostle says) were our ensamples,' *i. e.* types and images of us." From the mutual connection of the Head and His members, the Jewish people, wherein they image forth our Lord, reflect also His Body, the Church, as well as in their more direct resemblance; nor is it in their waywardness, or their rebellions, or their turning back to Egypt only, that they shadow out individuals. In God's dealings with them also they picture His dealings with His Church, which He formed into one in Christ out of them and of the Gentiles.

God's dealings with them, then, not only give instruction, (as any knowledge of God must,) but are a prophecy; peculiar situations of the Jewish people are

[s] c. Faust. L. xxii. c. 24.

prophetic warnings or encouragements; and it may be that a very minute correspondence will be found between the histories of the Jewish and Christian Church. At all events, we ought to look to striking occasions, where God's dealings were more visibly manifested, as grounds whereon to build our conduct and our hopes. The passage of the Red sea was one of those occasions; its typical relation to the Christian Church St. Paul has authoritatively declared; St. Matthew has pointed out the relation of the Exodus, which it completed, to our Lord's call out of Egypt; the Song of Moses, wherein he praised God for His mercies therein, itself looked on and furnished the form and language of other prophecy; and its use in the Universal Church, as a hymn of praise, shews them to have recognised its continued Christian meaning and application.

At the very verge of that deliverance, thus solemnly commemorated in the Jewish and Christian Church, when the whole early people of God seemed to be in a great strait, entangled in the land, and shut in by the wilderness, the sea before them, and behind them "all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen, and his army," Moses uttered the prophetic words, "Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." The peril was at its height; the Church seemed on the very brink of destruction; Egypt, the emblem of Antichrist, was ready to destroy, and there was no way left, when God "made the depths of the

sea a way for His people, that the ransomed of the Lord might pass over[5]."

These words, which to fleshly Israel must have seemed so strange, and which to weak faith echo so strangely still, contain two parts, a duty and a blessing. They are not mere words of encouragement; they impose a duty, and annex a blessing to its fulfilment. "Quietness and confidence" were to be "their strength." They were to "stand still," and *so* should they "see the salvation of God." And this condition of blessing runs continually through the whole history of the Jewish and Christian Church. As the first sin of man was trust in self and mistrust in God, so the correction has continually been, mistrust in self and trust in God. When God has tried His chosen servants or His chosen people, the most frequent trial perhaps has been this, whether they would tarry the Lord's leisure, be content to receive God's gift in God's way, and, at least, take no wrong measures for obtaining it, whether they would be content, not to hasten or to turn to the right hand or the left; but "stand still," and "see the salvation of their God." They who have stood this trial have been eminent saints, the jewels of the Lord; they who have failed in this, have been like vessels, destined for some high use, but, through this one flaw, marred in the fire which was to prove and form them. Even when unlawful means have not been used, yet the employment of any means, until God gave *the*

[5] Isaiah li. 10.

means into the hand, were followed by pain and grief. Thus Abram and Sarai waited ten years for the promise, and then Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai, and Ishmael was born. Ishmael too had a blessing for Abraham's willing faith, who resigned him and his own hopes in him, yet was he a grief to both Abraham and Sarah, and to their descendants. The child, whose birth they had wished for, they themselves cast out; and "he who was born after the flesh," in himself and in his seed, "persecuted him who was born after the Spirit." By faith [t] Moses slew the Egyptian; yet because this earnest zeal was not sufficiently subdued to do God's will and His only, he was forty years a stranger in the desert; and yet one like unbidden act cost him the land of Canaan. Jacob obtained the promise appointed to him before his birth; yet because he obtained it in the way of human device, "few and evil were the days of his pilgrimage;" Isaac waited twenty-one years for the fulfilment of the promise, and passed a peaceful life, strangely contrasted with his son's disquiet. Israel, in faithless fear of Ammon, asked for the king, who had been spoken of to them in the Law; and it became a sin and a snare to them; and God "consumed them and their king [u]." Saul waited not for Samuel, for "fear the Philistines should come down upon him, and he had not made supplication unto the Lord;" and he was told, for this first sin, "now would the Lord have established thy throne upon Israel for ever, but now thy kingdom shall not continue, be-

[t] Acts vii. 23, 24. [u] 1 Sam. xii. 25.

cause thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee[x]." David (of himself hasty and jealous) evinced himself the "man after God's own heart," in preferring rather to be "hunted like a partridge on the mountains," than to obtain that which God had promised him, until God should give it him. Jeroboam, though by nature what men call able and of a noble spirit[y], by not waiting, and by human wisdom, became guilty of rebellion, his house was cut off, and himself became a proverb, with the miserable title, "who made Israel (the Lord's promised, chosen people) to sin." Baasha[z] and Jehu were raised up by God to execute judgment on their masters, yet because they did this, and joined therewith policy of their own, the blood, which was righteously shed, was demanded of their hands, and God "avenged the blood of Jezreel on the house of Jehu[a]." "Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord[b]," yet because he relied on the king of Syria for that wherein he should have relied on the Lord of Hosts, Hanani denounced God's judgments; "Herein thou hast done foolishly; therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars[c]." The inaugural visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, in different ways, lay the same burthen upon them, that they should be the willing spontaneous instruments of God; that they should use no words of their own, but speak every word given them by God: as the Apostles were afterwards forbid-

[x] 1 Sam. xiii. 12—14. [y] See 1 Kings xi. 28. [z] 1 Kings xv. 29, xvi. 2 and 7. [a] Hos. i. 4. [b] 1 Kings. xv. 14. [c] 2 Chron. xvi. 7—9.

den to premeditate what words they should use, but were to "speak what should be given them in that hour[d]; "—an exercise at once of faith and faithfulness. And why speak of man, when He in Whom our nature was restored, as a part of the restoration of that nature, and as an example of what should be realized in His members, underwent man's threefold trial "of the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and vainglory[e]," in this same way, whether He would obtain for Himself that which was His, in any other way than that which was appointed! When He had refused all, "Satan," we are told, had "ended all his temptation[f]." He left to His disciples the same rule and the same promise; "Ye shall be hated of all men for My Name's sake; but there shall not a hair of your head perish; in your patience possess ye your souls[g]." The disciple and the Church were to be hated like their Master and their Lord; they were to withstand in the same way, by patient self-possession of their souls, and with and through Him to stand. And, again, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, but whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it[h]; " and "the meek shall inherit the earth." Through patient suffering did the Son obtain the heathen for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession; as He said[i], "If I be lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all men unto Me." "It is enough for the disciple that

[d] S. Matt. x. 19, 20, S. Luke xii. 11, 12.
[e] 1 S. John ii. 16. [f] S Luke iv. 13. See S. Aug. on Ps. viii. § ult.
[g] S. Luke xxi. 17—19. [h] S. Luke ix. 24. [i] S. John xii. 32.

he be as his Master." By *patient* (the word implies *suffering*) waiting for God, an unresisting resistance unto blood, did the Church take root in the whole world. It would seem as if St. Paul's imprisonment was a hindrance to the Gospel: so, it seems, he may himself have feared; this was the affliction of his bonds: but they "fell out *rather*," he writes [k], "to the furtherance of the Gospel;" the "bonds of St. Paul in Christ" carried the Gospel into the household and court of the Cæsar[l], and "in all other places," and gave confidence to many; as, in later times, the captivity of Rome brought in the Gospel among the Vandals; and Christian slaves took captive their conquerors. The afflictions of the Thessalonians sounded out the Gospel to Macedonia and Achaia[m]. "*The signs of an Apostle* were wrought among you," says St. Paul to the Corinthians[n], "in all *endurance*," as well as in "signs and wonders and mighty deeds." "The work of an Evangelist," bequeathed by St. Paul to Timothy and his successors, was to "watch in all things, and to *endure hardships*[o]." It is a *Christian* proverb, (and proverbs become such by the frequency of their application,) that "the blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church." The Gospel alone made known that non-resistance was strength, because "the strength of God was made perfect in weakness." "The more," says Origen[p], "kings and the rulers of nations and people every where afflicted them,

[k] Phil. i. 12—14. [l] v. 13. and iv. 22. [m] 1 Thess. i. 6—8.
[n] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [o] 2 Tim. iv. 5. [p] c. Cels. vii. p. 713. ed. Ben.

the more they multiplied and prevailed exceedingly[q]." The spiritual sons of the Gospel were multiplied by the self-same means as His chosen people in Egypt, by God's blessing on patient submission to injury. We are multiplied," says Tertullian, "so often as we are mown down by you. The blood of Christians is seed[r]." And Justin[s], himself a Martyr, relates how, "when he was content with Platonism, the endurance of Christians, and their fearlessness of death and every thing accounted fearful," won his first attention to the Gospel. "When an ungodly man," says S. Chrysostom[t], "bears rule, persecuting us on every side, and encompassing us with innumerable evils, then doth our state become bright and glorious." And not in these only, but in the more fretting, because petty, oppressions to which

[q] Exod. i. 12. [r] Apol. c. 50. S. Aug. in Ps. lxx. s. 2. § 4. strikingly connects the death of the Martyrs with that of their Lord: he places them in juxta-position; yet only so as to shew how he felt that it was from His Blood-shedding that theirs had their efficacy. "When Christ came, He was crucified, died, rose again, called the Gentiles; they began to be converted, became Martyrs strong in Christ, the faithful blood was shed, the harvest of the Church arose. This was the youth of the Church." And again, Serm. 287. in natal. Martyr. Protas. et Gervas. § 3. "The Lord first died for him, as was meet, and Peter afterwards died for the Lord, in the order which was meet. The thorny road was first laid and trodden down by the feet of Apostles, and so became smoother to those who were to follow. The earth was filled with Martyrs, as with the seed of blood, and from that seed arose the harvest of the Church. Dead, they testified to Christ more than alive. To-day they testify, to-day they preach; the tongue is mute, the deeds speak. They were seized, were bound, imprisoned, brought forth, racked, burnt, stoned, stricken down, set aloft for wild beasts. In all their deaths they were scoffed as despicable; but 'precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.' *Then*, 'precious in the sight of the Lord, only; *now*, in our sight also. For *then*, when to be a Christian was a reproach, the death of the saints was despicable in man's sight; they were abhorred, held in execration: it was cast out as a curse, 'So mayest thou die, so be crucified, so be burnt!' What believer would not now long for such curses?"

[s] Apol. ii. § 12. p. 96. ed. Ben. [t] De S. Babyla, § 8.

they were exposed. "We were enjoined not to strive," says Justin[u], "but through endurance and meekness to lead all from things shameful and evil desires. And this we can shew you in many cases, where men, from being violent and oppressors, were changed, being subdued either by narrow observation of a neighbour's lasting endurance, or having noted the strange patience of fellow-travellers when defrauded, or having made trial of it in commercial intercourse." And this the more illustrates their conduct under deeper suffering,—that they suffered, not simply because they must suffer or deny the faith, not because they could not resist, but because they ought not, and so would not. God forbid that we should so wrong the memory of the blessed Martyrs, as to think, (as controversialists now traduce them[x],) that they were Martyrs because they had not strength to resist. They were Martyrs, rather because they had strength *not* to resist, because they had strength to resist themselves. They "filled the world[y]" (I use their own language,) had "penetrated into every corner of it[z];" they were portions of the armies. Early as Tertullian, the appeal was made, "You[a] must decimate Carthage, if you would destroy us; spare thyself, if not

[u] Apol. i. § 16. p. 53.

[x] "If the Christians formerly did not depose Nero and Dioclesian and Julian the Apostate and Valens the Arian and the like, it was that they wanted secular strength." Bellarmine de Pontif. Rom. l. v. c. 7. He adds, "But Christians are not bound, nay, they ought not, with evident peril of religion, [i. e. in man's sight,] to tolerate an unbelieving king." See others also ap. Bp. Taylor, Sermon on Nov. 5. Works, vol. vi. p. 612. ed. Heber.

[y] Arnob. l. i. p. 27. cf. p. 9, 10. [z] Lactant. de M. P. c. 3. fin. [a] Ad Scap. c. 5.

us; if not thyself, spare Carthage." "No one of us," says a blessed Martyr[a] of the same Church, "resists, when he is apprehended, nor avenges himself against your injustice and violence, although our people is an exceedingly numerous host," (nimius et copiosus.) What, then, had the Christians turned against their destroyers, and employed against the worn-out and enervated luxury of the crumbling Empire that energy with which they upheld it, had they acted instead of suffering? Truly then they had lost their strength, avenged themselves on their enemies, and like Samson perished—as to their real life. But they "had not so learned Christ." "The weapons of *their* warfare were not carnal, though mighty through God for the pulling down of strong-holds, casting down every high thing that exalteth itself, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ[b]." They had been taught the lesson, which the heathen Emperor, when revealed to him, but half understood, ἐν τουτῷ νίκα. Women, the ignorant, the young, mechanics, peasants, overcame the learning and the strength of the world, by endurance; and so they taught the might which they had conquered, to unlearn confidence in its own might, that when they were weak, then were they strong[c]. They overcame by the rack, by torture, by the fury of wild beasts, by the flames, by the red-hot iron seat, by pincers which mangled the flesh so that there remained scarce a vestige of the human form—

[a] S. Cyprian, (quoted by Bp. Taylor, l. c. p. 613.) ad Demetrian. p. 192. ed. Fell.
[b] 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. [c] Ib. 10.

not by using them, but by enduring them; they endured more than we could think that human malice could invent, or human sufferance endure: and in truth it was not what it seemed, but satanic malice which invented, and Divine strength which endured. So the smoke of their earthly torment went up as a sweet savour to God, Who, for His Son's Sacrifice accepted this sacrifice, and their countenances being "marred more than the sons of men," became images of Him, "in whom the Father was well pleased." They who could not be overcome, overcame; passiveness and unresistingness overcame the world; they overcame it by Him Who had overcome it, by taking up His cross, and following Him. And as they hung upon His cross, emblems, as it were, and shadows, yea and members of Him, He imparted to their sufferings one part of the efficacy of His own, and they also, by His might, being "lifted up from the earth," drew all men—not to themselves, but—to Him, whose witnesses they were. "Christians," says S. Justin[d], or one of his time, "abound more and more through suffering every day. —See you not how they are cast to the beasts, that they may be made deny their Lord, and are not overcome? See you not how they *abound in proportion to the increase of their sufferings?* These things seem not like the work of men; but *they are the power of God, and indications of His presence.*"

And, afterwards, when the State oppressed the Church, and upheld a blasphemous heresy against it,

[d] Ep. ad Diognet. translated in Tracts for the Times, Records, No. 15.

it was by the same weapons that the Church prevailed, not obeying man, when God was the rather to be obeyed, yet suffering whatever man could inflict. It was amid Arian persecutions, profaner in some respects than the heathen, that the five-times-exiled Saint, Athanasius the Great, upheld and transmitted to us the Catholic Doctrine, the rich reward of the exile and persecution of nearly half of his nearly half century's Episcopate. It was by readiness to submit to all things that St. Ambrose and St. Basil retained the Churches of their provinces for the right faith. "He is not liable to confiscation," answered St. Basil to the messenger of Valens[e], "who has nothing; unless indeed you want these worn-out rags, and a few books, which are my whole substance. Exile I know not, who am not bounded by place, and neither regard this as mine, where I now live, and yet all, wherever I may be cast, as mine, or rather God's, with Whom I am a stranger and a sojourner. And what hold could tortures have, when they would find no body, except for the first stroke? for

[e] S. Greg. Naz. Orat. Funeb. in Magn. Basil. § 49. p. 807. ed. Ben. (cf. Greg. Nyss. c. Eunom. l. i. p. 313. ed. Morell.) Modestus had expressed his surprise, that Basil did not fear. "B. What should I fear; what suffer? M. What? Any one of the many things, which I can inflict. B. What are they? tell me them. M. Confiscation, exile, tortures, death. B. If you have aught besides, threaten me therewith; for none of these have any hold on me. M. How?" This explains the form of S. Basil's answer, which is no declamation, but a simple answer to threats. Modestus remarked that he had never so been spoken to. "B. For perhaps you never met with a Bishop." Modestus returned to Valens, and said, "O king, we are conquered by him who is set over this Church. He is superior to threats, words, persuasions. You must try one of the less noble sort. Against him, you must either use open force, or not expect him to yield to threats." Valens yielded.

this alone is in your power. But death were a benefactor, for it would bring me sooner to God, to Whom I live, and serve, and for the most part have died, and have of old time been hastening." "And thus," says St. Gregory of Nyssa[f], "he was set forth by God, as Elias in the time of Ahab, and brought back all to the right way, engaging with those under authority, combating with generals, speaking fearlessly to kings, escaping the hold of his assailants; as having nothing whereby they might seize him." St. Ambrose repressed the people who loved him, and overcame the Arian Emperor of the world by peril of death[g].

And when they received gifts from the state, it was not as mendicants, but as "priests of the Most High God." They received them in the name of God, not for themselves, nor as "desiring a gift but rather desiring fruit which might abound to the account[h]" of the givers. It was by a readiness to make sacrifices, that the "riches of the Gentiles flowed in" unto them, when they seemed to be given not to men,

[f] Paneg. t. iii. p. 404. c. d.

[g] "If you ask any thing of mine," was S. Ambrose's answer, when required to cede a Church to the Arians, "such as my estate, my money, or whatever else of this sort, I will not refuse, although every thing of mine belongs to the poor; but the things of God are not subject to the Emperor's power. Seek ye my patrimony? enter on it; my person? I will yield it. Would ye hale me to prison or to death? it were a joy to me. I will not be fenced in by the encompassing multitude, nor lay hold of the altar, imploring for life, but more gladly will I be sacrificed for the altars." Ep. 20. § 8. And afterwards, "I may neither yield the Church, nor is it well for thee, O Emperor, to take it. Exalt not thyself; if thou wouldst continue to reign, be subject to God. It is written, 'to God the things of God, the Cæsar's to Cæsar.' Palaces belong to the Emperor, Churches to the Priest. The public, not the sacred, walls are committed to thee." Ib. § 16.

[h] Phil. iv. 17.

(who cared not for them and were content not to receive them,) but to God, Whose ministers they were. St. Ambrose could then boldly and truly expostulate with Valentinian[i], whom they had almost persuaded to furnish the expenses of the heathen sacrifices. "What wilt thou answer to the priest when he saith to thee, 'The Church seeks not thy grants, because thou hast with grants adorned the temples of the Gentiles? The altar of Christ rejects thy gifts, because thou hast made an altar to idols.'" St. Laurence[k] yielded up his life, not the treasure of the Church, committed to him, to profanation; he took not "the gold of the temple to give to the king of Assyria," and thus he saved the deposit committed to him, and by the constancy of his death gained to himself a greater treasure, the crown of martyrdom, and many souls, which he won to Christ.

It is for instruction only that we may ask why God should so have annexed the blessing of conquest to enduring suffering, and made patience mightier than what men call active virtues. One would not presume to think one knew all the grounds. It may be that they have some mysterious connection with the sufferings of Christ, which pass our understanding. Some such connection is indicated by St. Paul's words, "fill-

[i] Ep. xvii. ad Valentinian. sect. 14. p. 827. ed. Bened. A characteristic saying is preserved of S. Thomas Aquinas. He found Innocent IV. counting money. "Innoc. The Church, you see, is no longer in the age, when she said, 'Silver and gold have I none.' S. Thom. True, holy father; but neither can she say to the sick of the palsy, 'Rise up and walk.'"

[k] See the history at length in Tillemont Hist. Eccl. tom. iii. p. 16 sqq.

ing up what remaineth of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church[l]," as though it pleased God, that the union of Christ and His members should so be set forth, that as He is persecuted in His members, so the more eminent of His saints, who were more closely united with Him, knowing, as St. Paul again says, "the fellowship of His sufferings, and being made conformable to His death[m]," should shadow Him forth, by suffering in the flesh for their brethren, emblems of His vicarious, though not of His meritorious, death. Suffering for others may be so far well-pleasing to God, as having a communion with the Sufferings of His beloved Son; and doubtless it may make those, who are partakers of it, more capable of the communication of the merits and influence of His Passion, wherein they have been in a manner joined, being baptized with His baptism, and having drunk of His cup.

Then, also, it may be needful, in the wisdom of God, for the perfecting of His saints. As all trial implies pain, so the trial of the most precious vessels, it may be, is to be accomplished by pains proportionate. It seems not without special meaning that the analogy of gold is so often pointed out by Holy Scripture. God sheweth us in this natural process an emblem of things spiritual. If even gold, which in the end perisheth, must yet be tried in the fire, how much more must faith, being more precious, so be proved[n].

[l] Col. i. 24. [m] Phil. iii. 10. [n] 1 S. Pet. i. 7.

But, besides, it is evident that so God's power and glory is most shewn. "Then all men that see it shall say, This hath God done, for they shall perceive that it is His work[o]." There is a natural instinct, which recognises that when things are too intricate for man, God will interpose. Heathen poetry speaks of a perplexity of affairs, which claims God to interfere[p]. A Jewish proverb says, "When Israel is brought to the brick-kilns, then cometh Moses;" a saying remarkably illustrated by the whole book of Judges. And Scripture itself has consecrated a like proverb, "In the mount of the Lord shall it be seen or provided[q]," i. e. at the last moment, when faith and obedience have been tried to the uttermost, and there seemeth no help left, and that God would indeed exact what man could scarce endure, then would God from heaven avert the suffering, or crown the enduring faith by His blessing. "The Lord will provide." So Joesph rose from the dungeon, and Daniel from the lions' den, to rule empires for the sake of His people. The gallows were prepared, the edict was issued, the whole scattered people of God was given into their enemies' hand; the king passed one sleepless night, Esther ventured her life, the people was saved, the adversary hanged. Sennacherib[r] had arrived at Nob; he was "shaking his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion;" on the morrow

[o] Psal. lxiv. 9. Pr. B.

[p] Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus Acciderit. Hor. de A. P. 191. and the Greek Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς. Our proverb, "Man's necessity is God's opportunity," and "When things are at the worst, they'll mend," express the same belief.

[q] Gen. xxii. 14.

[r] Is. x. 32 sqq.

it was to be destroyed; "in that night the angel of the Lord went out; early in the morning they were all dead corpses[s]." At St. Paul's first answer, "no man stood with him, all forsook him;" then "the Lord stood with him, and strengthened him[t]."

Then, also, since man's self-will was the cause of his fall, when he would be wiser than God, and in his own way be as God, God would thus teach him to submit his own will, to renounce dependence upon himself, to quit his own wisdom and his own schemes, to let every thing, if needs be, go out of course, and then, "when the earth is weak and the inhabiters thereof," it will appear that the Lord "beareth up the pillars of it, and will say to the ungodly, Lift not up your horn, for God is the Judge; He putteth down one and setteth up another[u]." It is a practising of our daily prayer, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven," it is a preparing, a qualifying for, a practising, a foretaste, of Heaven—to do God's will blindly, and consent that it may be done, cheerfully, without forecasting how it may end, whither it may lead, careful only about this, that it be His will. It is an Angel's life to obey unquestioning, and fits for Angelic duties and Angelic glories.

Lastly, there is room to fear lest, mingling in human schemes for her own security, the Church should leave her dependence upon God, and adopt insensibly the maxims of the world. "Resist not evil" is a precept

[s] 2 Kings xix. 35. [t] 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. [u] Ps. lxxv.

plain in its *mode* of execution, though hard to fulfil; it prescribes a difficult but a plain track. But, admit the principle that man may resist evil, it is no longer easy to say where and how resistance begins to be sin. Man cannot avoid difficulties; they are essential to trial; he may, by shrinking from them, substitute greater, but he cannot escape them. And this difficulty is increased by the very immensity of the interests at stake. Acts, which have given occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme, have arisen out of principles in themselves indisputable. No one, for instance, could doubt of the superiority of things spiritual to things temporal, or that the office of a Bishop of Christ's flock is higher than that of a temporal sovereign; that the sufferings of hell are so dreadful that any present agonies are blessings, if they prevent them; that men will be damned for wrong faith, as well as for unholy lives. Yet, plain as these things are, it is even the more miserable, that, in such a cause, kings should be deposed, subjects absolved from their oaths and allegiance, murder, treason, rebellion, assassination, lying, perjury, secret slaughter of whole bodies at once, should ever have been justified by Divines, writing in the Name of Christ[w]. Well may those "who think they stand, take heed lest they fall."

[w] See Bp. Taylor's learned Sermon on the Fifth of November. He gives, as cases, the justification of the murder of Henry the third of France, (which the assassin indeed did on the authority of the divines he had asked, p. 583, 5, it was praised by Sixtus V. in full consistory, p. 589, 90.) and of Henry the Fourth. (p. 585.) The Gunpowder plot was apologized for by Bellarmine and others. (ib. 586.) So also the massacre of S. Bartholomew, (see below,) and the Irish

The principle then of Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the conduct of the martyrs and the early Church, is to await God's time, to suffer so long as He wills, not to help ourselves—to "stand still, and see the salvation of God."

The general conduct of our Church has been true to her first principles, to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's; to do nothing against the command of God, but to suffer every thing which the Cæsar may require. It was thus that the seven Bishops mainly checked James's tyranny, refusing to do, but submitting to suffer, what

Massacre of 1641 by Urban VIII, "whose joy thereat could not be expressed," (see ap. Rushworth, t. v. p. 504.) and who granted "a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to the Catholic warriors who were labouring to extirpate the workers of iniquity, who infected the mass of Catholic purity with the leaven of heretical contagion." (ibid. p. 525 sqq.) On the "deposition of princes by the see of Rome," Bp. Taylor refers to Bellarmine quoting "twenty-one Italians, fourteen French, nine Germans, seven English and Scotch, nineteen Spaniards, and these all very famous and very leading authors:" (p. 601.) on the "lawfulness of a private man to murder princes condemned of heresy and tyranny," Bp. Taylor quotes some eminent authorities among them. (p. 605.) All through the reign of Queen Elizabeth attempts to assassinate were recommended by the Doctors, and blessed by the Bishop of Rome. See Nicholl on the Fifth of November Service.

It is a remarkable counterpart, that, previous to the Great Rebellion, nonconformist preachers maintained, that "for defence of religion, *and reform of the Church*, it is lawful to take arms against the king:" (Dugdale's Late Troubles, p. 73.) as did the Socinian Hoadly, that "we are only forbidden to resist good governers:" and the Statute of I W. and M. st. II. c. 2. § 9. which not only excludes from the inheritance of the crown "any one who should be reconciled to, or hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, profess the Popish religion, or marry a Papist," but declares "*the people in such case absolved from their allegiance*," strangely agrees with the principles of the Church of Rome; for, as Bp. Taylor argues in this case, "it is plain that killing a prince is a certain consequent of deposing him, unless the prince—be bound not to resist, and as really give over his kingdom quietly, as he is bound. For if any of these should fail, there can be but very slender assurance of his life." (p. 603.)

was unlawful; it was thus that even in the Great Rebellion men cheerfully took the spoiling of their goods; it was thus that in events familiar to us, the members of this place [x], at different periods, suffered what was unlawful, rather than compromise their principles;—and we cherish their memories.

The two events, for which we keep this day as an annual thanksgiving to God, together, strikingly illustrate these principles. 1. That we may safely leave things to God. 2. That there is great risk, that man, by any impatience of his, will mar the blessing which God designs for His Church.

In the plot, from which this day is named, God had permitted things to come to the uttermost; every preparation was made, every scruple removed; a Roman priest [y] had solemnly given the answer, that, for so great a benefit to the Church, their own people too might be sacrificed; the innocent might be slain, so that the guilty majority escaped not. The secret was entrusted to but few, was guarded by the most solemn oaths and by the participation of the Holy Eucharist, had been kept for a year and a half, although all of the Roman Communion in England knew that some great plot was being carried on, and were praying for its success; inferior plots had been forbidden by Rome, lest they should mar this great one; no suspicion had been excited, and there was nothing left to excite suspicion, when God employed means, in man's sight, the

[x] In the times of the Great Rebellion and under James II.

[y] Garnet the Jesuit priest [and others. Nicholl on the C. P.]

most unlikely. He awoke, at the last, one lurking feeling of pity for one person in the breast of but one, so that a dark hint was given to that one: and He caused him who gave it, to miscalculate the character of his own brother-in-law, or entrust him with more than he was aware; then He placed fear in that other's breast, so that, through another and distant fear, he shewed the letter which contained this dark hint; then, when the councillors despised the anonymous hint, as an idle tale, He enlightened the mind of the monarch, to discover the dark saying, which to us it seems strange that any beforehand should have unravelled; and when even then the councillors had surveyed the very spot, and discovered nothing, He caused the monarch to persevere, undeterred, until He had brought the whole to light. Yet to see more of this mystery of God's Providence, and how He weaves together the intricate web of human affairs, and places long before the hidden springs of things, we must think also, how He ordered that one of these few conspirators should be intermarried with one of the few Roman peers, and so desired to save him; and by the conspiracy from which God had shielded the monarch's early life, He quickened his sense of the present danger; so that while men were marrying, and giving in marriage, and strengthening themselves by alliances, God was preparing the means whereby this kingdom should be saved against the will of those so employed; and while men were plotting against a sacred life, God was lay-

ing up in the monarch's soul the thought, which Himself should hereafter kindle to save it. Verily, "a man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps[z]." "The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and He pondereth all his goings; his own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins[a]." The words of the Psalmist, selected for this day's service, find a striking completion in this history[b]. "[c]God hid him from the secret counsel of the wicked, from the insurrection of the workers of iniquity—they encourage themselves in an evil matter; they commune of laying snares privily; they say, Who shall see them? they search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search; the inward thought of every one of them, and the heart, is deep: but God shall shoot at them with an arrow; suddenly shall they be wounded; so they shall make their own tongue to fall upon themselves."

But it yet more illustrates the teaching, and is an argument of encouragement to our Church, how God in two neighbouring countries permitted similar plots to be accomplished. To human sight it is as strange that the massacre of S. Bartholomew should have been perpetrated, as that we should have escaped. The circumstances of that massacre even remind one of that destruction which extorted from the Heathen poet the confession, that it could not have been accomplished,

[z] Prov. xvi. 9. [a] Ib. v. 21, 22. [b] See Barrow's Sermon on this text and day, Serm. xi. [c] Ps. lxiv. 2 sqq.

"si fata Deum, si mens non læva fuisset." The chiefs, on whom it fell, were men, the wisest of their age[d], practised in avoiding surprises, alive to treachery, taught caution by their profession; yet neither past treachery, nor present oft-repeated warnings[e], nor the half-completed assassination of the chief[f], as a herald of the impending massacre, nor the forebodings of one, "[g]Dei jussu non unquam creditus," nor the knowledge that their enemies, who had feigned a retreat, were still hard by[h], nor the menaces reported to them by their spies from those whom they were trusting[i], nor the bringing them together like sheep for the slaugh-

[d] e. g. the. Admiral Coligny.

[e] Coligny was warned by very many both by word of mouth and letter. Thuanus, l. lii. p. 805. "He was especially warned sharply in a letter, of the decree of the Papists, that faith was not to be kept with heretics, of the queen's Italian guile, and the king's profaneness, hypocrisy, and cruelty from his youth: a conversation of the king with his mother was reported, in which he had boasted of his playing his part to the queen of Navarre, and had sworn frequently to her that he would bring them all in into her toils." (Ib. 806.) And again, by those of Rochelle, who, on being civilly put off, applied to the king of Navarre, but in vain; a play was enacted, in which the Protestants were represented as cast into Hell, which "some interpreted ill," so that F. Earl of Montmorency left Paris." (Ib. 808.)

[f] The Admiral. The shot came from the house of a Canon, preceptor of the Duke of Guise, and the assassin was connected with him. Coligny recognised it as the fruit of his reconciliation with him; yet remained secure in Paris." Continuat. de Fleuri H. E. l. clxiii, §. 5. "The tragedy," said the Vidame de Chartres, "having begun with the wounding of Coligny, would soon end with the massacre of the rest; he therefore advised to quit Paris instantly." (Ib. § 12.)

[g] The Vidame de Chartres.

[h] The princes of Guise, who feigned a rupture with the king; "but it was known that they had not left Paris." (Ib. § 13.)

[i] "Some Romanist courtiers, seeing the Calvinists leave the Church of Notre-Dame, not to hear the Mass at the marriage of the king of Navarre, had told them that their scruples would not last long; their spies had heard from the servants of Charles de Gondy, the king's Chamberlain, that more blood than wine would be spilled at that marriage." (Ib. § 12. from De Thou, l. lii. p. 813.)

ter[k], nor the setting a well-known enemy as a guard to their chief[l], nor the commencing tumults[m] could wake them from the death-sleep of security which was to end in the sleep of death. "Instamus tamen immemores cæcique." "Surely," says Solomon, "in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird[n]; " unless, adds Job, "God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath He imparted to her understanding[o]." Rome alas! justified the plot which failed, and Gregory XIII. ordered, and himself attended, a procession and thanksgiving for that which succeeded[p]. Both plans proposed

[k] The king had made the greater part of the Protestant nobles and gentry lodge near the admiral. The captains of the quarters had orders speedily to mark the lodgings, to take in writing the names of those who professed Calvinism and to collect them as much as possible in the neigbourhood of Coligny; and H. M. said very loud, that every body might hear, that he forbad any Catholic to approach that neighbourhood, and would have any, who contravened this order, fired upon." (Ib. § 15.) "These and other indications," adds De Thou, "and the reports every where whispered, had sufficed to warn the Protestants, if they had not been infatuated." (p. 814.)

[l] Cosseins, one of the greatest enemies of the admiral.

[m] "The admiral supposed that the tumults arose only from the people stimulated by the Guises, and that they would retire so soon as they saw the guard under the orders of Cosseins placed at his gate to defend him; he was not undeceived until he learnt that his first gate had been forced, and that a musket had been fired in his court." (Ib. § 20.) "A little before," says De Thou, p. 815, "observant persons had noticed that armed men were running to and fro in the city and round the Louvre; that the people were excited, threats every where heard, and thence they anticipated what would be; but Coligny only sent to inform the king, who assured him he had nothing to fear. At the same time, Teligni was told, that porters were carrying arms into the Louvre; but he despised the report, blamed such suspicions as needless, and forbad to inform Coligny of them."

[n] Prov. i. 17.

[o] Job xxxix. 17.

[p] Ib. § 40. Gregory also "struck some medals to perpetuate its memory; on one side of which was himself, on the other an angel holding a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, exterminating heretics, and especially the admiral." "This he did," we are told, "regarding only the benefit which he imagined must result from it to the Catholic religiòn in France." Ib. from the Trésor Chronol. du P. de S. Romuald in fol. p. 661.

the same thing, the extinction of those who were or were held to be heretics. The one was carried on secretly, the other almost openly: of the one there were no intimations beforehand; in the other, they were frequent: the one seemed secure, being intrusted to a few; the other was in the hands of many: in the one, he on whom the execution depended, shrunk from sin so dreadful; Charles the Ninth hesitated to the very last, and was ready to retract[o]; in the other they had no compunctions, or had stifled them. The depth of guilt in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, (if any thing,) seemed the more to call down the avenging interference of God, through the multiplied hypocrisy and perjuries whereby it was carried on[p]; yet the one, which every thing earthly combined to overthrow, succeeded; the other, which every thing tended to ensure, failed. "Verily, there is a God that judgeth the earth."

"Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known;" and it is

[o] "The queen, even at midnight, fearing lest the king, whom she thought she perceived still fluctuating and hesitating at the atrocity of the guilt, should change, went to his bedchamber, whither Anjou and others, and Guise, presently repaired, as agreed on. Then they relate, that after a long conversation to and fro, the king, when hesitating, was rebuked by his mother, for that by the delay he was letting slip so fair an occasion of subduing his enemies. At which speech, the king being of a very savage spirit and accustomed to shed blood, was fired, as being charged with cowardice, and gave orders for its execution. The queen, taking advantage of this impulse, lest he should relax, if an interval were given, hastened the signal, which was to have been given before daybreak." De Thou, p. 816.

[p] Especially on the part of Charles the Ninth. It was permitted, but avenged. His mother survived all her children but one, who was slain shortly afterwards, and she who had "made mothers childless," was "childless among women," her family extinct.

Thou who "leddest Thy people like a flock[q]," though by human hand. Far be it from us to say that we understand God's counsels; why in the one case He sent warnings, yet allowed the plot to be completed; in the other He sent none, but Himself destroyed it; He seemed to "take His rest, and to consider in His dwelling-place, like a clear heat upon herbs, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest," (as it were, Himself maturing and bringing about their devices,) "but afore the harvest, when the bud was perfect, and the flower become the ripening grape, He cut off the sprigs—and took away, and cut down the branches[r]." But this we must see, that those who were delivered (though not for their own merits) were passive, and that it was all God's hand; while the foreign Protestants, who perished, were an active, busy, scheming body, with worldly wisdom; and again we must with thankfulness acknowledge that it was the English Church whom God so preserved.

Yet she too has not been secure, when she forgot wherein "her great strength lay." In Ireland, for a time, she mingled her counsels with those of a different reformation[s], joined in turbulent proceedings

[q] Ps. lxxvii. 19, 20. [r] Is. xviii. 4, 5.

[s] "The British Protestants, transplanted in Ireland, having every moment before their eyes all the horrors of popery, had naturally been carried into the opposite extreme, and had *universally* adopted the highest principles and practices of the puritans. Monarchy, as well as the hierarchy, was become odious to them; and every method of limiting the authority of the crown, and detaching themselves from the king of England, was greedily adopted and pursued." Hume, Hist. c. 55, who proceeds to mention some of their measures against their king.

against her earthly sovereign, and sunk her peculiar character in the cabals of earthly politics. Towards her Roman fellow-subjects she preserved gentleness and peace, and they had been remarkably favoured[t]. Yet "God brought fire out of the house of Abimelech to devour the men of Shechem;" her evil towards Charles He requited upon her own head from those whom she trusted, and among whom she dwelt securely. In this case, again, all things human combined to discover the plot, and in human sight its concealment seemed inexplicable[u]; but again all the hints were neglected[x]; the plot had been from six to eight years in preparation[y]; it was well known in England, Spain, and other foreign countries[z]; intimations were given to the king, and were by him communicated[a], but neglected

[t] Sir J. Temple (an Irish Privy-Councillor,) Irish Rebellion, pp. 14, 15, 81. Declaration of Commons concerning the rise of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland, July 25, 1653, ap. Rushworth, p. iii. vol. ii. p. 346. Hume l. c. Lord Orrery ap. Nalson, Impartial Collection, vol. ii. p. 535.

[u] "First, I must needs say, howsoever I have observed in the nature of the Irish such a kind of dull and deep reservedness, as makes them with much silence and secresie to carry on their business: yet I cannot but consider with great admiration how this mischievous plot, which was to be so generally at the same time, and at so many several places acted, and therefore necessarily known to so many several persons, should without any noise be brought to such maturity, as to arrive at the very point of execution, without any notice or intimation given to any two of that huge multitude of persons who were generally designed (as most of them did) to perish in it." Temple, pp. 16, 17. The Long Parliament, to exculpate itself, and as a pretext for their rebellion, dared to ascribe the plot to our martyred Charles; but their statement of the utter unlikelihood of the plot in itself is illustrative. See Declaration of the Commons, ap. Rushworth, l. c. v. fin. See also Letter of Irish Council, ap. Nalson, p. 516.

[x] Temple, p. 17. Nalson, ii. p. 519.

[y] Temple, p. 67.

[z] Testimony of the Roman Catholic priests named in Temple, p. 67.

[a] By his Embassadors in Spain; see Rushworth, p. [408.] Nalson, ii. p. 565.

by those whose lives were threatened; revealed at last by one of the religion which was to be extirpated, but only when too late [b]; the means of its execution were put into men's hands by those professedly most hostile to them [c]; and the massacre, wide, horrible, indiscriminate, miserable too in its details of cruelty [d] fell unabated upon this portion of our Church; for "their Rock had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up [e]."

And now we may perhaps the more readily learn our lesson from that other event, which has been included in this day's thanksgiving, the arrival on this day of him who became William III. Man's sin is no hindrance to thankfulness for God's mercy; rather, the more we sinned, the more should we be thankful to God for not giving us over to our sins, for making that, as it now is, at last legitimate to us and our duty, which in our forefathers was sin, yea, and for the chastisements with which He has visited our sins. The arri-

[b] Temple, p. 18 sqq.

[c] The 8,000 men of the army raised by Strafford, which the Long Parliament detained and turned loose upon Ireland. Hume l. c. The Roman Catholic members joined in preventing their being sent abroad, as the king wished, on the plea that they might become disaffected, if they served with the Spaniards. Nalson, ii. 565. It is mentioned in Lord Macguire's account as one of the encouragements to the rebellion, Ib. 544. Hume names also as a ground, that "the Catholics *assisted by the Protestants*, had so diminished the royal prerogative, and the power of the lieutenant, as would much facilitate any conspiracy."

[d] "By the computation of the priests themselves that were present, and principal actors in all those tragedies, and were directed by some chief rebels of Ireland to take this computation, 154,000 Protestants, men, women, and children, were massacred between Oct. 23, and March 1." Declaration of Commons, l. c. The atrocious details are given at length by Sir J. Temple, p. 84. sqq. as attested upon oath. He computes the whole number destroyed at 300,000, men, women, and children. P. 6.

[e] Deut. xxxii. 30.

val of William may have saved the nation from the miseries of anarchy and civil war, which but for his arrival, had men pursued the same course, might have followed, and in this the Church and nation might have been grievously injured; and for this and for the preservation of our Church amid this convulsion, we have great cause of thankfulness. Further, it seems that their sin was not wilful, that they no more foresaw that they should end in dethroning the son[f], than Cromwell thought at first of murdering the father. It may be too that our forefathers in a degree deceived themselves, and persuaded themselves, that because they did not *formally* dethrone their sovereign, they were not guilty of rebellion. God, in His mercy, may have accepted this their shame, whereby they shrunk from their own act, and so mitigated His judgments. But it were in us but hypocrisy to use these pleas, and justify the action of our forefathers; to say, that when a sovereign retreats from his kingdom before an advancing foreign army, his servants arrested, and his guards displaced, he is other than deposed; that they who join herein are not guilty of rebellion; and that they who in a self-called convention made the prince of Orange king, did not act against their allegiance to the sovereign,

[f] The decision to appoint a king rather than a regent was carried only by *two* votes in the House of Lords; and that, in the absence of those, who (as the Primate) held the whole meeting illegal. The revolution was obviously accomplished finally, by the refusal of William to accept of anything short of the Crown, and the dread of consequent anarchy: *i. e.* they adopted a measure, which they would gladly have avoided, but which their first wrong steps forced upon them.

to whom they had plighted their faith. The misconduct of one justifies not the sin of another; David, though of God anointed, lifted not his hand against him, who had been once anointed by God, though now his princely spirit was taken from him, and "an evil spirit from the Lord came upon him[g];" and so, while we thank God, we should humble ourselves, and pray Him, not to remember our sins, or the sins of our forefathers.

Probably it was by man's contrivance that these two events are so brought together upon the same day; politicians about William probably retarded his arrival in order to take advantage of the old memories of the day. The instructiveness of their combination is other than they meant. In the one case, without his own merit, man was passive, and God delivered him from extremest peril; in the other, where, had men like our Bishops and a Confessor of this place[h], remained passive under the shadow of God's wings, the tyranny would have passed over, man interposed schemes of his own. They did that, which their Lord upon the Cross was taunted to do, but did not,—[i] they "saved themselves;" and so they were permitted to mar the good purpose of God. I say, "mar;" for though God has been abundant in mercy, no one can have traced the state of our Church and nation, since

[g] 1 Sam. xvi. 14 sqq. [h] Hough, President of Magdalen College.

[i] "What did He teach thee, in that He hung there, in that He would not come down, but endurance amidst taunts, but that thou shouldest be strong in thy God?" S. Aug. Enarr. in Ps. lxx. Serm. i. § 11.

that second rebellion, without seeing God's judgments, though tempered with mercy. Let any one ask when was the golden age of our Divines? All will say, the reign of Charles II., when their passive virtues had been called out, and they exercised by suffering. The last century every one as readily condemns as the deadest and shallowest period of English theology and of the English Church. And this could be traced, (were this the place,) to the line which men took in resisting James's evil. The state feared and hated the Church, which it causelessly suspected; it could not understand that men might on principle object to the act which set the Sovereign on the throne, and yet upon principle obey, yea teach others cheerfully to obey, the Sovereign whom God had permitted to be so placed. It ejected a valuable portion of her members, the Nonjurors; divided, and so weakened her; cut off from her one element of teaching; gave her Bishops for secular ends[k], and profaned her offices to strengthen secular parties; wilfully corrupted her, and stirred up enemies against her and our Holy Faith[l]. As clearly could it be shewn that the present storm, which lowers around our Church and State, is but a drawing out of the principles of what men have dared to call the "glorious revolution;" as that revolution (though in this portion of our country, but still in this only, by

[k] On the gradual usurpations of the Ministers of the Crown in the disposal of the higher offices of the Church, see a series of papers in the British Magazine, beginning from Feb. 1837.

[l] See "Remarks on the benefits of Cathedral Institutions, and on Clerical Education," pp. 124—128. ed. 2.

God's mercy without bloodshed, as indeed, besides His other mercies, He generally restrains men in a second revolution, by an implanted instinct, from renewing the miseries of the first) was the sequel[m] and result of the first rebellion. The name given to the act of 1688 is no question of words. The very service of this day evinces the feeling even of such as could take the oath of allegiance to William, that it is not indifferent to God, how we look back upon His dealings with our forefathers. If we would not be partakers with other men's sins, we must disavow them; while we boast of them, we make ourselves sharers in them. If we would cut off the curse entailed by the fathers upon the children[n], we must disclaim the act which has entailed it. We should thankfully acknowledge God's "undeserved mercies," not glory in our father's sins, so may He exempt us from the impending chastisement.

Not so our Church, who in her most solemn service, acknowledges unto God, that kings "have His authority," that they "are His ministers." Even the service of the day, as far as it may in any degree, since she acquiesced in its adoption, be regarded as her voice, speaks of "the wisdom and justice of God's Providence," and we acknowledge it to be such that James's evil fell upon his own head, that all his unrighteous

[m] The lax principles, which had gained ground through the first rebellion, are strongly noticed, in the interval before 1688, in the writings already referred to, by Bp. Sanderson (especially § xix.) and Dean Sherlock.

[n] See Bp. Taylor's Sermon, "The Entailed Curse cut off."

acts hurt himself; but she speaks not of our glory, but of "God's great and undeserved goodness." And again, the Homily on Rebellion seems by its very words prophetically to have denounced the measure wherein men now glory. "Had Englishmen," these are its words[o], "at that time known their duty to their prince set forth in God's word, would natural subjects have rebelled against their sovereign lord the king? Would English subjects have taken part against the king of England and Englishmen with the French [one need but change the nation] king and Frenchmen? Would they have sent for and received the Dauphin of France with a great army of Frenchmen into the realm of England? Would they have sworn fidelity to the Dauphin of France, breaking their oath of fidelity to their natural lord the king of England, and have stood under the Dauphin's banner displayed against the king of England? Would they have expelled their sovereign lord the king of England out of London, the chief city of England?" The parallel ceases; if the Homily condemned the hard terms placed upon king John, much more would it the refusal of all terms to king James. The excuse that James was a bad king, in the sentiments of the Homily, but throws back the sin higher. "Shall subjects," it says[p], "obey valiant, stout, wise, and good princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel—against undiscreet

[o] Homily against Wilful Rebellion, pt. vi. p. 545. ed. Oxf. 1822. A Rubric for this day enjoins, that "if there be no Sermon, one of the six Homilies against Rebellion shall be read." [p] Ib. p. 511, 2.

and evil governors? God forbid!—shall the subjects both by their wickedness provoke God, for their deserved punishment, to give them an undiscreet or evil prince, and also rebel against him and withal against God, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a prince?"—And then it lays up, as it were, for future use, the remedy I have now been insisting on. "If[q] we will have an evil prince (when God shall send such an one) taken away, and a good in his place, let us take away our wickedness, which provoketh God to place such a one over us, and God will either displace him, or of an evil prince make him a good prince, so that we first will change our evil into good—Else for subjects to deserve through their sins to have an evil prince and then to rebel against him, were double and treble evil, by provoking God more to plague them. Nay let us either deserve to have a good prince, or let us patiently suffer and obey such as we deserve." The Homily seems prophetically to have traced the line, on which we ought to have trodden, the blessings which promised to follow it, and the evils which ensued from forsaking it. And for the pretence of religion, it says[r], "what a religion it is, that such men by such means would restore, may easily be judged; even as good a religion surely, as rebels be good men and obedient subjects, and as rebellion is a good mean of redress and reformation, being itself the greatest deformation[s] of all that may possibly be."

[q] Homily against Wilful Rebellion, p. 512, 3. [r] Ib. pt. iv. p. 534, 5.

[s] Montaigne has a passage remarkably according with the language and

Not so, again, the early Church; they resisted not evil; the whole city of Alexandria petitioned Julian to retain their Bishop, the saintly Athanasius, but rebelled not; the Christians of Gaul invited not the Barbarians to interfere and save them; the Christians held the balance of the Empire in their hands, yet even then took the fiercest of the ten persecutions patiently; the Christians of Persia implored not the Christian Emperors of Rome to interfere with armed force against those into whose hands God had given them; to try them "they were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might attain a better resurrection," and so in God's good time, the giant statue crumbled in its very base, and the stone cut out without hands "filled the earth."

Not so, lastly, holy Scripture, which that Church well understood. If slaves were to obey "froward masters," much more, argues our Homily[t], ought subjects "to obey sharp and rigorous princes." Scripture bids us obey princes "not only for wrath but for conscience sake;" it knows not our subtle distinctions

sentiments of the Homilies, Essais, l. iii. c. 12. After denying that there could be any evil in a goverment, which should be cured by a drug so deadly, he says, "*What impiety is it, not to look for, from God, any aid simply His, and without our cooperation.* I often marvel, whether among so many, who trouble themselves with these necessities of the State, there was ever one, of intellect so weak, as to be in good earnest persuaded, that he was promoting a *reformation* by the worst of *deformations;* that he was advancing towards his own salvation, by the most direct causes which we have of a most certain damnation, that overthrowing the state, magistracy, and the laws, under the guardianship of which God has placed him—he can render any aid to the all-holy tenderness and justice of Divine Law."

[t] l. c. pt. i. p. 409.

of "social compact[u];" it bids us peremptorily obey kings, and what kings[x]? what compact, not with their subjects, but with human nature itself, had not Caligula and Claudius and Nero broken? It may be that God gave the Roman Empire such prodigies of wickedness then, that Christians might have no excuse to rebel. No one can doubt but that St. Paul would have taken his lot with our outcast Bishops; and if this be so obvious that one dare scarcely put the case from this place, how dare we call that "glorious" which he would have condemned? Had it been glorious, "to

[u] This is, in these days, assumed as an axiom, as men's wont is, when they give themselves little pains to understand their own principles: the strong contrary statements of Bishop Sanderson may cause some to re-consider their views. "As for those in the next place that would derive the original of all Government from the people by way of pact or contract: it may suffice to say, that they take that for granted which never yet was proved, nor (I dare say) will ever be proved while the world standeth, either from Scripture, Reason, or History. Jus gladii, the right and power of the sword (which is really the Sovereign Power) belongeth, we know, to kings, but it is by the ordinance of God, not the donation of the people: for he beareth the sword (St. Paul telleth us) as God's minister, from Whom he received it; and not as the people's minister, who had no right to give it because they never had it themselves. If any shall say they had, the proof lieth on their part, to shew how they came by it; whether God gave it them, or they took it themselves. If God gave it them, let it be made appear when and where the first grant was made; let some evidence be produced to justify the claim, or at least some credible testimony, or pregnant presumption to render it probable that there was some such thing done, though the records be lost. If none of all this can be done, it remaineth, that if they had it, they took it. And if they so did, it was saucily and sacrilegiously done at the first; and by our Saviour's presage, (Matt. xxvi. 52.) like enough to prosper with them accordingly at the last." Bishop Sanderson's preface to Archbishop Usher's Power of the Prince, sec. 15. After which he proceeds to expose several of the difficulties involved in the assumption.

[x] "This (1 Tim. ii. 1, &c.) is S. Paul's counsel. And who, I pray you, was prince over the most part of Christians when God's Holy Spirit by St. Paul's pen gave them this lesson? Forsooth Caligula, Claudius, or Nero; who were not only no Christians but pagans, and also either foolish rulers, or most cruel tyrants." Homilies, ib. p. i. p. 513.

God's name should have been the praise, for His mercy and truth's sake;" but now since it was men's act, they take to themselves the glory, when all was God's "undeserved mercy," and glory in their shame. Rather let us take to ourselvers the shame, and give to God the glory, for not having "dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities;" let us thank Him for His "great and undeserved mercies."

If ever these lessons were of moment, they seem likely to be so now, and we have reason to thank God for His Providence in so connecting the events of these two days, that their commemoration should be a yearly warning to us, in a way which they who appointed the latter festival[y] thought not of. What times are coming upon the earth, we know not, but the general expectation of persons of all characters in all nations is an instinct implanted by God to warn us of a coming storm. Not one nation only, but all; not one class of thinkers, but all; they who fear and they who hope, and who fear and hope things opposite; they who are immersed in their worldly schemes, and they who look for some "coming of God's kingdom;" they who watch this world's signs and they who watch for the next, alike have their eyes intently fixed on somewhat which is coming, though whether it be the vials of His wrath, or the glories of His kingdom, or whether the one shall be the herald to the other, none can tell. They who

[y] It was appointed not by, but rather against, the Church, and used as an instrument of oppression to her, a snare to the consciences of her ministers, and a political test against men who would have yielded a peaceable obedience.

can calculate what is likely, speak of it; they who cannot, *feel* its coming; the spirits of the unseen world seem to be approaching to us, and "awe comes on us, and trembling, which maketh all the bones to shake[z]," "all nations are shaken[a];" the sound, which for these many years has been heard and spoken of from this place[b], has been waxing louder and louder, and spreading wider: there is "upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth[c]." Times of trouble there have been before; but such a time in which every thing every where tends in one direction, to one mighty struggle of one sort, of faith with infidelity, lawlessness with rule, Christ with Antichrist, there seems never to have been till now. The ancient images of Antichrist are growing old, and decaying; and a more fearful Antichristian power, that of popular lawlessness which maketh its will its God, and will own neither God nor man but its own rule, seems to be held in, not by the weak threads of human rule, which it would snap "as flax burnt by the fire," but by the Almighty power of God, discovering His might

[z] Job iv. 14, 15. [a] Haggai ii. 7.

[b] The writer recollects in younger years, how, before any overt public act had taken place, such as must force upon men's minds the expectation of further changes, persons were, in this place, warned that evil times were coming, that the clouds were gathering, that there was a diseased tone in the public feeling, a distempered appetite; and these warnings became the more impressive, as they came from persons of different character, who had derived their impressions from different sources. Now we are become accustomed to our evils, and what then was regarded by sound judges as a symptom of disease, is now regarded as a common thing. [c] St. Luke xxi. 25, 26.

in human weakness. These are "fig-tree signs," whether "our redemption" indeed "draweth nigh," and this long warfare of this world be at last almost accomplished, or whether it shall be but some fuller image of that long longed-for coming, which shall be revealed, we cannot tell; enough for us that we have signs that God is more than heretofore visiting the earth, and that Satan more than heretofore is let loose upon it; that persons must and are taking their sides more decisively with Christ or with Belial.

Whether then this fearful conflict burst in our days, or when we are withdrawn, let those who live to share it, or any portion of it, recollect that our strength is to "fear not, stand still, and wait for the salvation of God." God hath shewn great mercies to our Church, as on this day, and those greater than to any other nation; trust we Him. Even now He seems, contrary to His dealings with all other nations, to have checked the waywardness of our course, and though we had done things displeasing in His sight, to be restoring us from the feverish sickness, wherein we had fallen, and bid us "go our way, and sin no more, lest a worse thing happen unto us." It is our duty indeed, as they did of old, to warn men of the great sin and danger of sacrilege, or apostasy, or interfering with the Church of God, or polluting her offices, or indifference and promoting error, lest we be guilty of the blood of others, if we warn them not; and in all lawful ways permitted to us, we are bound to extend truth, diffuse

right principles, as well as adorn them in our lives; but this done, recollect we, that our armour is not "the wisdom of this world, which shall come to nought," earthly activity and worldly schemes, but humiliation, acknowledgment of our past sins, prayers, fasting, watching, endurance, submission to men, and patient tarrying for God. Let the Church use these, let her use the Psalms and the prayers put into her hands and her mouth, use them not as forms but as realities; let her realize to herself that a great contest *is* going on between the dragon and the woman in the wilderness, and that prayers are the arms of the saints; that the welfare of each, his spiritual privileges, are bound up in the welfare of the whole Church, but that, besides, each ought to love the whole for herself, as the spouse and body of Christ: let her recollect that "the hearts of kings are in His rule and governance," and that He "stilleth the madness of the people;" and pray, as our Church with the ancient Church does, twice each day, "for the whole world, for kings and all that are in authority"—and they who seem to be hurrying on things with rapidity so fearful, will be found but to be bound around the wheels of God's Providence, not leading events but dragged along by them, to accomplish by their self- or free-will "whatsoever His hand and His counsel determined before to be done[d]." "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee; the remainder of wrath shalt

[d] Acts iv. 28.

Thou restrain." God warneth us by the very swiftness with which all things are moving around us, that it is He who is impelling them; man cannot impart such speed, nor rouse the winds from the four quarters of the heavens, nor bring men's varying wills towards one uniform result; and therewith He warns us to beware how we attempt to guide, what He thus manifestly is governing. As the trial of our faith is increased by the greatness of the interests at stake, so is it lightened by God's more visible Presence, which would awe us into confidence and quiet. The "Egyptians are behind" us, but the "pillar of the cloud" is between us and them. He will "remove the chariot wheels" of the enemy, though they drive on never so furiously. Those things only can be marred, which we ourselves mar. He would have us do our plain duty quietly, suffer evil, if needs be, patiently, and then await the end, placing our confidence not in our own strength, nor in the wisdom or numbers of any secular party, but in Him.

And let the young especially remember, that it is not by giving vent to their feelings, but by restraining them; not by blaming others, (in doing which they could scarcely avoid sin,) but by schooling themselves; by meekness, by self-command, by quietness, by peaceableness, by disciplining themselves, and by acting under discipline, by submitting to authority, even when they see not presently the reason, by acting, in their petty occasions, on faith, that they may best prepare

themselves for whatever duties, in the great army of their God, it may please Him hereafter to call them to.

In brief, then, we may be over-anxious even about holy things, such as the deliverance of the Church from unjust thraldom or from spiritual disadvantages. God allowed His chosen people to lie in bondage 400 years, and not till the set time was come, did He judge that power which enthralled them; and when afterwards He delivered them for their sins to Nebuchadnezzar, they were to "seek the peace of the city whither He had caused them to be carried captive, and after 70 years to be visited[l]." They "stood still," till Cyrus came, they invited him not, helped him not, but he acknowledged that "their God, the King of heaven, had given him all the kingdoms of the earth, and had given him in charge to build His temple at Jerusalem[m]." God is visibly working, and preparing the army, which "shall be willing in the day of His power[n]" but it is His day, His army, His power, and He must "give the word[o]." As of old the feet of the image were crumbling, the world was growing old, institutions were dissolving, but the people of God might not put a finger thereto, but "a stone cut out of the mountain *without hands* smote it, and brake it in pieces;" so must it be now: whether it please God to breathe fresh life into the old institutions of the world, or whether "He take away their breath, and they return to their dust," it must be His doing,

[l] Jerem. xxix. 7, 10. [m] Ezra i. 2. [n] Ps. cx. 3. [o] Ps. lxviii. 11.

not man's; what God doth, that is well done; we might mingle "hay, straw, and stubble" with His work, which in the day of trial will not abide. "O tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thy heart[p]:" "though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry[q]." "O Lord God of hosts, blessed is the man that putteth his trust in Thee[r]!"

[p] Ps. xxvii. 16. [q] Hab. ii. 3. [r] Ps. lxxxiv. 13.

O Lord, we beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion; that they who do lean only upon the hope of Thy heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by Thy mighty power; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen[s].

[s] Collect for the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.